arXiv:1012.5028v1 [math.DG] 22 Dec 2010

A frequency function and singular set bounds for branched minimal immersions

LEON SIMON[*] & NESHAN WICKRAMASEKERA[†]

Contents

§0 Introduction 1
§1 Preliminaries 3
§2 2-valued C^1 harmonic functions—Part I 6
§3 $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates for a class of linear equations 12
§4 2-valued C^1 harmonic functions—Part II 15
§5 Regularity for $u_a = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_2)$ and $v = \pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)$, Part I 19
§6 Some Growth Results for a Class of Linear Equations 25
§7 Regularity for $u_a = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_2)$ and $v = \pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)$, Part II 33
§8 A frequency function for v and the dimension of $\mathcal{K}_u$ 36
§9 Appendix: A simple connectivity lemma 42

Introduction

In [Wic08], the second author established a local $C^{1,\alpha}$ partial regularity theory for stable branched minimal hypersurfaces of multiplicity < 3. The main regularity theorem of [Wic08] in particular implies that locally near any point where it has one tangent cone equal to a multiplicity 2 hyperplane, a stationary integral varifold arising as the weak limit of a sequence of stable minimal hypersurfaces, each of which is immersed away from a closed set of singularities (including branch points) of locally finite codimension 2 Hausdorff measure, must be a $C^{1,\alpha}$ 2-valued graph over a domain in a suitable hyperplane for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$. It remained open how large the singular set of the varifold could be near such a point. Also left open was the question of the optimal value of α.

Here we give answers to these questions by proving that, near such a point, the varifold is always a $C^{1,1/2}$ 2-valued graph, and that either it is regular (which means that in a neighborhood of the point, either the support of the varifold decomposes as the union of two smooth embedded (intersecting) graphs or the varifold is equal to a multiplicity 2 copy of a single regular embedded minimal graph), or the set of its singularities (i.e. branch points) has Hausdorff dimension precisely equal to $n-2$.

In fact we here establish, in Theorems 7.1, 7.4 and 8.10, that such results apply in arbitrary codimension $k \geq 1$ without any *a priori* stability assumption. That is, we

---

[*] Partly supported by NSF DMS–0104049 & DMS-0406209 at Stanford University

[†] Partly supported by NSF DMS-0601265 & DMS-0707005 at U.C. San Diego

show that any 2-valued $C^{1,\alpha}$ ($\alpha \in (0,1)$) function $u = \{u_1, u_2\}$ (with values of $u_j \in \mathbb{R}^k$) on an open ball B in $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose graph G, viewed as a varifold with multiplicity 2 at points where $u_1 = u_2$ and with multiplicity 1 at points where $u_1 \neq u_2$, is stationary in the cylinder $B \times \mathbb{R}^k$, must be a $C^{1,1/2}$ function, and that the set of its singularities, if non-empty, must have Hausdorff dimension equal to $n-2$. The $C^{1,1/2}$ regularity is of course optimal, as is shown by the case when $n = k = 2$ and u is the 2-valued function $u(x,y) = z^{3/2}$, $z = x + iy$, with graph $G = \{(w,z) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \approx \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 : w^2 = z^3\}$ which is a complex algebraic variety, hence minimizing in $\mathbb{R}^4$ as a 2-dimensional multiplicity 1 current, and hence stationary as a 2 dimensional multiplicity 1 varifold in $\mathbb{R}^4$.

The existence of large families of non-parametric branched $C^{1,\alpha}$ minimal hypersurfaces (i.e. the case $n \geq 2$, $k = 1$) has been established by the authors [SW07]. In the case $n = 2$, recently L. Rosales [Ros10] established the existence of further classes of such surfaces without the symmetry assumptions needed in [SW07].

The main tool used here to bound the size of the branch set is a monotone frequency function for the 2-valued difference $v = \pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)$. The frequency function allows one to produce non-trivial, homogeneous 2-valued stationary harmonic blow-ups at branch points. F. J. Almgren Jr. first introduced the notion of frequency function in the 1970's and used it to study energy minimizing multiple-valued harmonic functions and the singular set of area minimizing currents. Almgren's main work on these topics, available since the early 1980's in preprint form, was published posthumously in book form in [Alm00].

Establishing monotonicity properties of the frequency function in the present PDE setting depends crucially on knowing the $C^{1,1/2}$ regularity of the solution. In fact we need, and prove, more than that. We show that the (single valued) average function $u_a = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_2)$ of the 2-valued solution is of class $C^{1,1}$, and the 2-valued difference $v = \pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)$ is in $C^{1,1/2}$. Most of the present work goes into proving these regularity results, and involves in particular establishing a $C^{1,\alpha}$ Schauder theory and $W^{2,2}$ estimates for our 2-valued functions, as well as a "frequency gap" result for 2-valued stationary harmonic functions and growth estimates for 2-valued solutions to certain linear equations. Once the required regularity is established, it is straightforward to prove that the 2-valued difference function $v = \pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)$ satisfies a weakly coupled divergence form elliptic system with Lipschitz coefficients, and we can then apply appropriate modifications of the work of Garofolo and Lin [GL86] (which establishes monotonicity of a frequency function for single valued solutions of divergence-form elliptic equations with Lipschitz coefficients).

The remainder of the proof depends on more or less standard application of "dimension reducing" arguments utilizing the monotonicity of the frequency function in a manner completely analogous to the arguments in [Alm00].

1 Preliminaries

We use the notation $B_\rho(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| < \rho\}$, $\overline{B}_\rho(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| \le \rho\}$, $k \ge 1$ (k is the codimension), $B_\rho = B_\rho(0)$, and u denotes a $C^{1,\alpha}(B_1, \mathbb{R}^k)$ 2-valued function, so

1.1 $u(x) = \{u_1(x), u_2(x)\}$ (an unordered pair of points in $\mathbb{R}^k$) for each $x \in B_1$.

With such 2-valued functions $u = \{u_1, u_2\}, v = \{v_1, v_2\}$ we adopt the convention that

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)| &= |u_1(x)| + |u_2(x)| \\ |u(x) - v(x)| &= \min\{|u_1(x) - v_1(x)| + |u_2(x) - v_2(x)|, |u_1(x) - v_2(x)| + |u_2(x) - v_1(x)|\} \end{aligned}$$

and we write $u \in C^1(B_1)$ if for each $x \in B_1$ there is a 2-valued affine function L_x on $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the form

$$L_x(h) = \{u_1(x) + A_1(x)h, u_2(x) + A_2(x)h\}$$

(assuming points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are written as columns). Here $A_1(x), A_2(x)$ are $k \times n$ matrices and

$$\lim_{h \to 0} |h|^{-1} |u(x) - L_x(h)| = 0, \ \lim_{y \to x} \sup_{|h|=1} |L_x(h) - L_y(h)| = 0,$$

and in this case $Du(x)$ denotes the (unique) 2-valued function $\{A_1(x), A_2(x)\}$, and we sometimes also write $Du_1(x), Du_2(x)$ rather than $A_1(x), A_2(x)$. Also we say $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$ if

$$|u|_{1,\alpha;B_1} < \infty,$$

where $\alpha \in (0,1)$ is given and

$$|u|_{1,\alpha;B_1} = \sup_{B_1} |u| + \sup_{B_1} |Du| + [Du]_{\alpha,B_1},$$

where $|u|, |Du|$ and the Hölder coefficient $[Du]_{\alpha,B_1}$ are interpreted in the usual way; thus

$$\begin{aligned} |u| = |u_1| + |u_2|, &\quad |Du| = |Du_1| + |Du_2| \\ [Du]_\alpha = &\sup_{x_1, x_2 \in B_1, \, x_1 \ne x_2} |x_1 - x_2|^{-\alpha} |Du(x_1) - Du(x_2)|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$|Du(x_1) - Du(x_2)| = \min\{|A_1(x_1) - A_1(x_2)| + |A_2(x_1) - A_2(x_2)|,\\ |A_1(x_1) - A_2(x_2)| + |A_2(x_1) - A_1(x_2)|\},$$

with $A_1(x), A_2(x)$ as above. The area functional is given by

$$\mathcal{A}(u) = \int_{B_1} \big(\sqrt{g(u_1)} + \sqrt{g(u_2)}\big)$$

where $g(u_\ell) = \det(\delta_{ij} + D_i u_\ell \cdot D_j u_\ell)$ (notice this makes sense because $\sqrt{g(u_1)} + \sqrt{g(u_2)}$ is a well defined single-valued function on B_1), and we assume that u is a stationary point for this functional in the sense that $G = \operatorname{graph} u = \{(x, y) \in B_1 \times \mathbb{R}^k : y = u_1(x) \text{ or } y = u_2(x)\}$ is a stationary varifold. Thus we assume that

1.2 $$\int_G \operatorname{div}_G X \, \theta d\mathcal{H}^n = 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n + k, X \in C^1_c(B_1 \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R}^{n+k}),$$

where θ is the multiplicity function (= 2 and points where $u_1 = u_2$ and = 1 at points where $u_1 \neq u_2$) and where $\operatorname{div}_G X$ denotes the tangential divergence of X on G. Thus $\operatorname{div}_G X = \sum_{j=1}^{n+k} e_j \cdot \nabla_G X_j$, with $\nabla_G X_j$ denoting the gradient of X_j on G (i.e. $P_x(DX_j)$, where P_x is the orthogonal projection of $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ onto the tangent space of G at any point $x \in G$). In particular if we let

$$\mathcal{K}_u = \{x \in B_1 : u_1(x) = u_2(x) \text{ and } Du_1(x) = Du_2(x)\}$$

then in each ball $B_\sigma(y) \subset B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_u$ we can label the values u_1, u_2 of u such that $u_1|B_\sigma(y), u_2|B_\sigma(y)$ are $C^\infty(B_\sigma(y))$ solutions of the minimal surface system, so that

1.3 $$\mathcal{M}(u_j) = 0 \text{ in } B_\sigma(y), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

with $\mathcal{M}(u_j) = (\mathcal{M}_1(u_j), \ldots, \mathcal{M}_k(u_j))$,

1.4 $$\mathcal{M}_\kappa(w) = \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n D_j\big(\sqrt{g(w)} g^{ij}(w) D_j w_\kappa\big), \quad \kappa = 1, \ldots, k,$$

where $(g^{ij}(w)) = (g_{ij}(w))^{-1}$, $g_{ij}(w) = \delta_{ij} + D_i w \cdot D_j w$, $g(w) = \det(g_{ij}(w))$. Our aim is to show that the closed set $\mathcal{K}_u$ in fact has Hausdorff dimension $\leq n - 2$. Observe that, since u is C^1 and 2-valued one can check the inclusion

1.5 $$\mathcal{B}_u \subset \mathcal{K}_u,$$

where $\mathcal{B}_u$ is the "branch set" $\mathcal{B}_u$ of u, which is defined to be the set of points $y \in B_1$ such that there is no neighborhood U_y of y such that the values u_1, u_2 can be ordered in

U_y in such a way that each of u_1, u_2 is a single-valued C^1 function in U_y. Observe that the inclusion 1.5 fails in general for Q-valued C^1 functions with $Q \geq 3$.

The function

$$v(x) = \{\pm\tfrac{1}{2}(u_2(x) - u_1(x)) : x \in B_1\}$$

defines a 2-valued $C^{1,\alpha}(B_1, \mathbb{R}^k)$ function which is "symmetric," in the sense that at each point x the two values of $v(x)$ are negatives of each other. $\mathcal{K}_u$ is then the same as

$$\mathcal{K}_v = \{x \in B_1 : |v(x)| = 0,\ |Dv(x)| = 0\}.$$

The main results proved here are local results valid in a neighborhood of a point (0 say) in $\mathcal{K}_u$ and since we can always (rotating the graph if necessary) assume that $u(0) = \{0, 0\}, Du(0) = \{0, 0\}$, we can, and we shall, assume (after rescaling) that in fact

1.6
$$\sup_{B_1} |u| + \sup_{B_1} |Du| + [Du]_{\alpha, B_1} \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

where ε_0 is to be specified (depending only on n, k) later. Notice that by using 1.6 together with (single-valued) quasilinear elliptic estimates in balls contained $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_v$, we have for each $\theta \in (0, 1)$

1.7
$$|v(x)| + d(x)|Dv(x)| + d(x)^2|D^2u(x)| \leq C\varepsilon_0 d(x)^{1+\alpha}$$

on B_θ, where, here and subsequently, $d(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, \mathcal{K}_v)\,(= \operatorname{dist}(x, \mathcal{K}_u))$, and where $C = C(n, \theta)$. There is a well-defined single-valued $C^{1,\alpha}$ "average" u_a given by

1.8
$$u_a = \tfrac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_2) \text{ in } B_1,$$

where u_1, u_2 are as in 1.1. A principal ingredient in the proof that the frequency function for v has the appropriate monotonicity properties will involve showing that u_a is of class $C^{1,1}$ (which we do in §7).

As mentioned above, the function $v = \{\pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)\}$ is a 2-valued $C^{1,\alpha}$ symmetric function, and for this reason much of the analysis that follows will relate to 2-valued symmetric functions. Since we use integral estimates it is necessary to discuss Sobolev spaces of such functions. So assume that w is a 2-valued symmetric (i.e. at each point the two values of w are negatives of each other), $\mathcal{Z}_w = \{x \in B_1 : w(x) = \{0, 0\}\}$, $w \in C^0(B_1) \cap C^1(B_1 \setminus \mathcal{Z}_w)$, and observe that in any ball contained in $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{Z}_w$, we can represent w uniquely as $\pm w_1$ for some unique positive C^0 function w_1. We say that $w \in W^{1,p}(B_1)$ if $D_j w \in L^p(B_1)$, where $D_j w$ is the symmetric 2-valued function defined locally near a point $\xi \in B_1 \setminus \mathcal{Z}_w$ as $\pm D_j w_1$ and $D_j w$ is defined to be $\{0, 0\}$ on $\mathcal{Z}_w$.

In practice it is usually more convenient to use the equivalent definition

1.9 $$D_j w = \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} D_j\gamma_\delta(w)$$

(limit taken in L^p), where $\delta > 0$ and γ_δ denotes a smooth odd ($\gamma_\delta(-t) = -\gamma_\delta(t)$) increasing function on $\mathbb{R}$ with the properties that γ_δ vanishes identically in some neighborhood of 0, $\gamma_\delta'(t) \le 1$ for all t, $\gamma_\delta(t) \equiv t-\delta$ for $t > \delta$, $\gamma_\delta(t) = t+\delta$ for $t < -\delta$. Using this characterization one can easily check for example that then $|w|^2 \in W^{1,p}(B_1)$ (as a single-valued function) with weak derivatives $2w\cdot D_j w$, assuming that we adopt the natural convention that, near points $\xi \in B_1 \setminus \mathcal{Z}_w$ where we can in a unique way write $w = \pm w_1$ with w_1 continuous,

1.10 $|w|^2$ and $w\cdot D_j w$ are taken to mean $|w_1|^2$ and $w_1\cdot D_j w_1$ respectively

on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{Z}_w$ (and $= 0$ on $B_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}_w$). Note that if $w \in C^1(B_1)\cap C^2(B_1\setminus\mathcal{Z}_w)$ is symmetric then the (classical or weak) derivatives $D_j w$ are in $C^0(B_1)\cap C^1(B_1\setminus\mathcal{Z}_w)$ and it therefore makes sense to define the second order weak derivative D_iD_jw by $D_i(D_jw)$ in accordance with the above discussion with D_jw in place of w. One then easily checks (using approximation involving γ_δ as above) that for example if $D_iD_jw \in C^1(B_1\setminus\mathcal{Z}_w)$ then $D_\ell(D_iwD_jw) = D_\ell D_iw\, D_jw + D_iw\, D_\ell D_jw$ on $B_1\setminus\mathcal{K}_w$, assuming that we define the products naturally as in 1.10 above.

2 2-valued C^1 harmonic functions—Part I

Given 2-valued symmetric $C^1(B_1,\mathbb{R}^k)$ function φ, we say that φ is harmonic if for each ball $B_\sigma(y)\subset B_1\setminus\mathcal{K}_\varphi$ there is C^1 harmonic function φ_1 on $B_\sigma(y)$ such that $\varphi|B_\sigma(y) = \{\pm\varphi_1\}$; of course if it exists such a φ_1 is unique.

Our first aim is to show that such symmetric C^1 functions are automatically locally $W^{2,2}$ in B_1, with an estimate on the $W^{2,2}$ norm and the Lipschitz constant.

2.1 Lemma. *Suppose that φ is a C^1 2-valued symmetric harmonic function on B_1 (in the above sense). Then $D^2\varphi\in L^2(B_\rho(y))$ (i.e. $D\varphi\in W^{1,2}(B_\rho(y))$) for each ball $B_\rho(y)$ with $\overline{B}_\rho(y)\subset B_1$, and we have the estimates*

$$\rho^{2-n}\int_{B_{\rho/2}(y)}|D^2\varphi|^2 + \sup_{B_{\rho/2}(y)}|D\varphi|^2 \le C\rho^{-n}\int_{B_\rho(y)}|D\varphi|^2$$

for all such balls $B_\rho(y)$.

Proof: Since $\varphi = \{\pm\varphi_1\}$ in any ball away from $\mathcal{K}_\varphi$, we have $\Delta|D\varphi|^2 = 2|D^2\varphi|^2$ on $B_1\setminus\mathcal{K}_\varphi$, so if γ_δ is a smooth non-negative convex function on $\mathbb{R}$ with $\gamma_\delta\equiv 0$ in some neighborhood of zero and $\gamma_\delta'(t) \equiv 1$ on $[\delta, \infty)$ for some $\delta > 0$, then we have that

$$\Delta\gamma_\delta(|D\varphi|^2) \geq 2\gamma_\delta'(|D\varphi|^2)|D^2\varphi|^2$$

on any closed ball $B \subset B_1$ (because $\gamma_\delta(|D\varphi|^2)|B$ has compact support in $B \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$), and so multiplying by a cut-off function which is identically 1 in $B_{\rho/2}(y)$ and zero outside $B_\rho(y)$, and integrating over $B_\rho(y)$, we obtain the required $W^{2,2}$ estimate by letting $\delta \downarrow 0$. Also the above inequality shows that $\gamma_\delta(|D\varphi|^2)$ is a subharmonic (single-valued) function in B_1, and so for each ball $B_\rho(y) \subset B_1$ we have the estimate $\sup_{B_{\rho/2}(y)} \gamma_\delta(|D\varphi|^2) \leq C\rho^{-n}\int_{B_\rho(y)} \gamma_\delta(|D\varphi|^2)$ and, again we can let $\delta \downarrow 0$ to get the required estimate for $\sup_{B_{\rho/2}(y)} |D\varphi|^2$.

2.2 Lemma. *Suppose that φ is a C^1 2-valued symmetric function on the ball $B_R(y) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, that φ is harmonic on $B_R(y) \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$ and not identically zero on $B_R(y)$, and that $y \in \mathcal{Z}_\varphi = \{x : \varphi(x) = \{0, 0\}\}$. Then*

$$N_\varphi(y, \rho) = \frac{\rho^{2-n}\int_{B_\rho(y)}|D\varphi|^2}{\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho(y)}|\varphi|^2}$$

is an increasing C^1 function of $\rho \in (0, R)$, $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y) = \lim_{\rho\downarrow 0} N_\varphi(y, \rho) \geq 1$, and $\mathcal{Z}_\varphi$ (and hence $\mathcal{K}_\varphi$) has empty interior.

2.3 Remarks: (1) $N_\varphi(y, \rho)$ is called the frequency function of φ, terminology introduced by Almgren [Alm00]. The frequency function was a key tool in Almgren's study of energy minimizing multi-valued functions and area minimizing currents. As observed by Almgren, the fact that $N_\varphi(y, \rho)$ is increasing is equivalent to the fact that

$$\log\Big(\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho(y)}|\varphi|^2\Big) \text{ is a convex function of } t = \log\rho,$$

because (as discussed in (2) below)

$$\rho^{2-n}\int_{B_\rho(y)}|D\varphi|^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}\frac{d}{d\rho}\Big(\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho(y)}|\varphi|^2\Big),$$

and hence $N_\varphi(y, \rho)$ can be written alternatively

$$N_\varphi(y, \rho) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\rho H'(y, \rho)}{H(y, \rho)}, \quad H(y, \rho) = \rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho(y)}|\varphi|^2.$$

(2) The proof of the monotonicity of N_φ will be based on the key identities

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)}|D\varphi|^2 = \int_{\partial B_\rho(y)}\varphi \cdot D_r\varphi \;\; \Big(= \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{\partial B_\rho(y)} D_r|\varphi|^2\Big)$$

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)}\Big(|D\varphi|^2\delta_{ij} - 2D_i\varphi \cdot D_j\varphi\Big)D_i\zeta_j = \int_{\partial B_\rho(y)}\Big(|D\varphi|^2(\rho^{-1}(x-y)\cdot\zeta) - 2D_r\varphi \cdot D_j\varphi\zeta_j\Big)$$

where ζ_j are Lipschitz in $\overline{B}_\rho(y)$, where $\overline{B}_\rho(y) \subset B_1$ and where the radial derivative $D_r\varphi_\ell$ is defined by $\rho^{-1}(x-y)\cdot D\varphi_\ell$ for $\ell = 1,\ldots,k$. These identities are readily checked using integration by parts, which is justified by virtue of Lemma 2.1.

(3) In view of the monotonicity in Lemma 2.2, it follows directly that $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y)$ is an upper semicontinous function of φ with respect to the $W^{1,2}$-norm; thus if $\varphi_j \to \varphi$ in $W^{1,2}(B_\rho(y))$ then $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y) \ge \limsup_{j\to\infty} \mathcal{N}_{\varphi_j}(y)$. By applying this to the functions $\varphi_j(x) = \varphi(x + y_j - y)$ we also have $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y) \ge \limsup_{y_j\to y} \mathcal{N}_\varphi(y_j)$.

(4) Note also that, with $H(y,\rho)$ as in (1) above, we have the following general growth facts related to N for φ as in 2.2:

$$\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y) \le \tfrac{\rho}{2} H'(y,\rho)/H(y,\rho) = N_\varphi(y,\rho) \le N_\varphi(y,R), \quad \rho \in (0,R],$$

and hence by integration we have the bounds

$$\Big(\frac{\rho}{R}\Big)^C \le \sqrt{\frac{H(y,\rho)}{H(y,R)}} \le \Big(\frac{\rho}{R}\Big)^{\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y)}, \quad \rho \in (0,R],\ C = N_\varphi(y,R).$$

(5) Notice that (4) above (with $R = 2\rho$) and the monotonicity of $N_\varphi(y,\sigma) \le N_\varphi(y,R)$ for $\sigma \in (0,R]$ imply that $C^{-1}H(y,2\rho) \le H(y,\rho) \le CH(y,2\rho)$ for $\rho \in (0,R/2]$ with fixed $C = 2^{N_\varphi(y,R))}$ and so by integrating with respect to ρ we have

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_{2\rho}(y))} \le C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}, \quad \rho \in (0,R/2],$$

again with fixed $C = C(N_\varphi(y,R))$.

Proof of 2.2: Observe first that by the first identity in 2.3(2) we see that $|\varphi| \equiv 0$ on $\partial B_\rho(y) \Rightarrow \varphi|B_\rho(y) \equiv 0$, so the frequency $N_\varphi(z,\rho)$ is well-defined unless $\varphi \equiv 0$ in $B_\rho(y)$. Also, taking $\zeta_j \equiv x_j - y_j$ in the second identity of 2.3(2), we see that

$$(1) \qquad \frac{d}{d\rho}\Big(\rho^{2-n}\int_{B_\rho(y)} |D\varphi|^2\Big) = 2\rho^{2-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho(y)} |D_r\varphi|^2 \Big(= 2\rho\int_{S^{n-1}} |D_r\varphi(y+r\omega)|^2\, d\omega\Big);$$

Notice that this can be alternatively written

$$\frac{dD(y,\rho)}{d\rho} = 2\rho\int_{S^{n-1}} |D_r\varphi(y+r\omega)|^2\, d\omega,$$

with $D(y,\rho) = \rho^{2-n}\int_{B_\rho(y)} |D\varphi|^2$, and the first identity in 2.3(2) can be written

$$D(y,\rho) = \tfrac{1}{2}\frac{dH(y,\rho)}{d\rho}$$

Assuming $\rho_0 \in (0,R)$ with $\varphi|B_{\rho_0}(y)$ not identically zero, one can now directly check from these two identities that

$$\tfrac{d}{d\rho}N(y,\rho) = 2H(y,\rho)^{-2}\rho\Big(\int_{S^{n-1}} \varphi_r^2 \int_{S^{n-1}} |\varphi|^2 - \Big(\int_{S^{n-1}} \varphi\varphi_r\Big)^2\Big), \quad \rho \in (\rho_0, R),$$

and, since the right side here is non-negative by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we thus have the monotonicity

$$\tfrac{d}{d\rho}N(y,\rho) \geq 0, \quad \rho \in (\rho_0, R). \tag{2}$$

Furthermore it then follows that

$$\mathcal{Z}_\varphi \text{ has empty interior,} \tag{3}$$

because otherwise, since φ is not identically zero by hypothesis, we could find $\sigma, \delta > 0$ and balls $B_\sigma(z) \subset B_{\sigma+\delta}(z) \subset B_R(y)$ with $|\varphi||B_\sigma(z) \equiv 0$ but $\sup_{B_\rho(z)} \varphi|B_\rho(z) > 0$ for all $\rho \in (\sigma, \sigma+\delta)$, and (see the discussion in Remark 2.4(1) above) since $\frac{d}{d\rho}N(y,\rho) \geq 0$ can be written $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\log(\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}\varphi^2) \geq 0$, where $t = \log\rho$, we see that $\log(\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}\varphi^2)$ is bounded below as $\rho \downarrow \sigma$ (because any convex function on an open interval is bounded below), contradicting the fact that $\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}\varphi^2 \to 0$ as $\rho \downarrow \sigma$. Hence we actually have

$$N_\varphi(y,\rho) \text{ is a well-defined } C^1 \text{ increasing function of } \rho \text{ for } \rho \in (0,R) \tag{4}$$

as claimed.

Finally, if $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y) < 1$ then we could choose $\rho_0 \in (0,R)$ such that $N_\varphi(y,\rho_0) = C_0 < 1$ and then Remark 2.3(4) would give $\sqrt{H(\rho)} \geq C\rho^{C_0}$ as $\rho \downarrow 0$, whereas since φ is C^1 with $\varphi(0) = \{0,0\}$ we must have $\sqrt{H(\rho)} \leq C\rho$ as $\rho \downarrow 0$. Thus we also have $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y) \geq 1$ for each $y \in \mathcal{Z}_\varphi$ as claimed.

2.4 Remarks. (1) Note that by examining the proof of the monotonicity of $N_\varphi(y,\rho)$ in the first part of the above proof, we see that $N_\varphi(y,\rho)$ can be constant in some interval $(\rho_0, \rho_0+\varepsilon)$ ($\varepsilon > 0$) if and only if we have equality in the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $\int_{S^{n-1}}\varphi_r^2\int_{S^{n-1}}|\varphi|^2 - \left(\int_{S^{n-1}}\varphi\varphi_r\right)^2 \geq 0$ which in turn is true if and only if φ_r is a constant multiple of φ for $|x-y| \in (\rho_0, \rho_0+\varepsilon)$, which is in turn true if and only if φ extends to be a homogeneous function with respect to the variable $r = |x-y|$, with degree $\beta =$ the constant value of $N_\varphi(y,\rho)$.

(2) In view of Remark (1) above we see that if φ is a 2-valued C^1 symmetric function which is harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$ and homogeneous of degree $\beta \geq 1$ (i.e. $\varphi(\lambda x) = \lambda^\beta\varphi(x)$), then $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(z) \leq \mathcal{N}_\varphi(0)$ for each $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $S = \{x \in \mathcal{Z}_\varphi : \mathcal{N}_\varphi(z) = \mathcal{N}_\varphi(0)\}$ is a linear subspace with $\varphi \circ \tau_z = \varphi$ for each $z \in S$, where τ_z is the translation $x \mapsto x+z$. This does follow directly from Remark (1) if one keeps in mind that if we have $z \neq 0$ and the two homogeneity conditions $\varphi(\lambda x) = \lambda^\beta\varphi(x)$ and $\varphi(\lambda x+z) = \lambda^\beta(x+z)$ for each $\lambda > 0$ and each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then we have, with $t \in \mathbb{R}$ arbitrary and $\lambda > 0$ chosen so that $\lambda^{-1} - \lambda = t$, $\varphi(x+tz) = \varphi(x-\lambda z+\lambda^{-1}z) = \lambda^{-\beta}\varphi(\lambda x-\lambda^2 z+z) = \lambda^\beta\varphi(\lambda^{-1}x-z+z) = \lambda^\beta\varphi(\lambda^{-1}x) = \varphi(x)$.

The following gap lemma will be used to establish a Liouville-type theorem for symmetric 2-valued harmonic functions (in 2.6 below), which in turn will be the main ingredient in the $C^{1,\alpha}$ Schauder theory of §3.

2.5 Lemma. *There is $\delta = \delta(n) \in (0,1)$ such that if $\varphi(x) = |x|^\sigma \varphi(|x|^{-1}x)$ is 2-valued symmetric C^1 homogeneous degree σ function with $\sigma \in [1, 1+\delta)$ and with φ harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$ and not identically zero, then $\sigma = 1$ and φ is linear (i.e. $\varphi(x) \equiv \{\pm\ell(x)\}$, where $\ell_\kappa(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n c_\kappa^j x_j$ for some constants c_κ^j, $\kappa = 1, \ldots, k$).*

Proof: We can assume that φ is real-valued (i.e. $k=1$) because each component φ_κ is either identically zero or satisfies the stated hypotheses with $k=1$ and φ_κ in place of φ.

The theorem is trivially true in case $n=1$, so assume $n \geq 2$. We first dispense with the case $\sigma = 1$. For $\delta > 0$ let $\gamma_\delta(t)$ be an odd function of t which is convex for $t \geq 0$, $\equiv 0$ in some neighborhood of 0, and which has $\gamma_\delta'(t) \equiv 1$ for $t \geq \delta$, and observe that $\gamma_\delta(D_j\varphi)$ has compact support in $S^{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$, and hence (since $D_j\varphi$ is harmonic and homogeneous degree 0 on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$) we have, interpreting products in the natural way on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$ (Cf. 1.10),

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} |\nabla_{S^{n-1}} \gamma_\delta(D_j\varphi)|^2 \leq \int_{S^{n-1}} \nabla_{S^{n-1}} D_j\varphi \cdot \nabla_{S^{n-1}} \gamma_\delta(D_j\varphi) = -\int_{S^{n-1}} (\Delta_{S^{n-1}} D_j\varphi)\, \gamma_\delta(D_j\varphi) = 0,$$

and hence $\gamma_\delta(D_j\varphi)$ is $\{\pm c_j(\delta)\}$ for some constant $c_j(\delta)$, and so $D_j\varphi$ is $\{\pm c_j\}$ for some constant c_j and the lemma is proved in case $\sigma = 1$.

To prove the case $\sigma \in (1, 1+\delta)$, observe if there is no δ as claimed, then we would have a sequence $\varphi^{(j)}$ of 2-valued symmetric C^1 functions, harmonic in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_{\varphi^{(j)}}$, not identically zero, and homogeneous of degree σ_j with $\sigma_j > 1$ and $\sigma_j \downarrow 1$. Let $\mathcal{K}_j = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi^{(j)}}$. Assume without loss of generality that we have normalized $\varphi^{(j)}$ so that $\|\varphi^{(j)}\|_{L^2(B_1)} = 1$ for each j. Then by 2.1 we have local $W^{2,2}$ and Lipschitz estimates for $\varphi^{(j)}$ and a subsequence (still denoted $\varphi^{(j)}$) converges locally uniformly and locally weakly in $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to 2-valued symmetric Lipschitz $W^{2,2}$ homogeneous degree 1 function φ.

With γ_δ as in the first part above, using the fact that $D_i\varphi^{(j)}$ is harmonic and homogeneous degree $\sigma_j - 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}(1) \qquad \int_{S^{n-1}} |\nabla_{S^{n-1}} \gamma_\delta(D_i\varphi^{(j)})|^2 &\leq \int_{S^{n-1}} \nabla_{S^{n-1}} D_i\varphi^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{S^{n-1}} \gamma_\delta(D_i\varphi^{(j)}) \\ &= (\sigma_j - 1)(\sigma_j + n - 3) \int_{S^{n-1}} D_i\varphi^{(j)} \gamma_\delta(D_i\varphi^{(j)}) \\ &\leq (\sigma_j - 1)(\sigma_j + n - 3) \int_{S^{n-1}} |D_i\varphi^{(j)}|^2 \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty,\end{aligned}$$

and so, by Rellich's theorem, in the limit as $j \to \infty$ we conclude $\nabla_{S^{n-1}} \gamma_\delta(D_i\varphi) = 0$ a.e. for each $\delta > 0$, so in fact $D_i\varphi$ is given by $\pm c_i$ for some constant $c_1, \ldots, c_n$. Modulo composition with an orthogonal transformation of $\mathbb{R}^n$ we thus have

$$\varphi(x) \equiv \{\pm c_0 x_1\} \text{ for some non-zero constant } c_0.$$

Observe that for each $\sigma, R > 0$ we have $B_R \cap \mathcal{K}_j \cap \mathbb{R}^n_\sigma = \emptyset$, and in fact $B_R \cap \mathcal{Z}_j \cap \mathbb{R}^n_\sigma = \emptyset$, for all sufficiently large j, where $\mathbb{R}^n_\sigma = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x_1| > \sigma\}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_j = \{x : \varphi^{(j)}(x) = \{0,0\}\}$, and

$$D_1\varphi^{(j)} \to \{\pm c_0\} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n_\sigma, \quad D_j\varphi^{(j)} \to \{0,0\} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n_\sigma \text{ for } j = 2, \ldots, n. \tag{2}$$

Observe also that if there is a constant c_j such that $D_2\varphi^{(j)} - c_j D_1\varphi^{(j)} = \{0,0\}$[‡] on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_j$ (hence on all of $\mathbb{R}^n$), then $\varphi^{(j)}$ is invariant under composition with translations in the direction $(-c_j, 1, 0)$ and so for $n \geq 2$ we could reduce the proof of the theorem from dimension n to $n-1$. Therefore, since the theorem is trivially true in case $n = 1$, we can henceforth assume without loss of generality that for all j,

$$\nexists\, c_j \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } D_2\varphi^{(j)} - c_j D_1\varphi^{(j)} = \{0,0\} \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_j. \tag{3}$$

Now, with $\sigma_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ fixed, select a constant $c_j (\to 0)$ such that

$$\int_{S^{n-1} \cap R^n_{\sigma_0}} (D_2\varphi^{(j)} - c_j D_1\varphi^{(j)}) D_1\varphi^{(j)} = 0, \tag{4}$$

and define

$$\psi^{(j)} = \|D_2\varphi^{(j)} - c_j D_1\varphi^{(j)}\|^{-1}_{L^2(S^{n-1})} (D_2\varphi^{(j)} - c_j D_1\varphi^{(j)}).$$

This is well-defined for all sufficiently large j by (3). Since $\psi^{(j)}$ is harmonic and homogeneous of degree $\sigma_j - 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_j$, we can use the argument of (1), with $\psi^{(j)}$ in place of $D_j\varphi^{(j)}$, in order to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{S^{n-1}} |\nabla_{S^{n-1}} \gamma_\delta(\psi^{(j)})|^2 \leq & \int_{S^{n-1}} \nabla_{S^{n-1}} \psi^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{S^{n-1}} \gamma_\delta(\psi^{(j)}) = \\ & (\sigma_j - 1)(\sigma_j + n - 3) \int_{S^{n-1}} \psi^{(j)} \gamma_\delta(\psi^{(j)}) \to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

for each $\delta > 0$ and hence $\psi^{(j)}$ converges locally weakly in $W^{1,2}$ to the symmetric ψ with $\psi(x) \equiv \{\pm c\})$ where c (constant) is not zero because $\int_{S^{n-1}} |\psi|^2 = 1$. However by multiplying by $\|D_2\varphi^{(j)} - c_j D_1\varphi^{(j)}\|^{-1}_{L^2(S^{n-1})}$ in (4), taking the limit in j (keeping in mind (2)) we then have $cc_0\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S^{n-1} \cap \mathbb{R}^n_{\sigma_0}) = 0$, contradicting the fact that c and c_0 are non-zero constants.

As a consequence of the Lemma 2.5 and Remark 2.3(1) we have the following Liouville-type result for 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}$ harmonic functions:

[‡] Note that $D_2\varphi^{(j)} - cD_1\varphi^{(j)}$ is to be interpreted in the natural way on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_j$ as $\pm(D_2\varphi_1 - cD_1\varphi_1)$, where as usual we locally write, on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_j$, $\varphi^{(j)} = \pm\varphi_1$ with φ_1 in C^1

2.6 Corollary. *If $\delta = \delta(n)$ is as in 2.5 and φ is a 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}$ function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\alpha \in (0,\delta)$, φ harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$ and $[D\varphi]_{\alpha,\mathbb{R}^n} < \infty$, then φ is affine (i.e. $\pm\ell$, where $\ell(x)$ is an affine function $c_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n c_j x_j$).*

Proof: We can assume φ is not identically zero. First consider the possibility that $\mathcal{K}_\varphi = \emptyset$. In this case we can write φ as $\pm\varphi_1$, where each component of φ_1 is a single-valued harmonic function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ which by the relevant Liouville theorem is an affine function.

Thus we can assume that φ is not identically zero and $0 \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi$, and so

$$0 < \sup_{\rho\in(0,\infty)} \rho^{1-n-2\alpha-2} \int_{\partial B_\rho} \varphi^2 \le C \sup \rho^{-2-2\alpha} \max_{|x|=\rho} |\varphi|^2 \le C[D\varphi]_\alpha^2 < \infty.$$

Thus $\log(\rho^{1-n-2\alpha-2} \int_{\partial B_\rho} \varphi^2)$ is bounded above on $(0,\infty)$, and since it is a convex function of $t = \log\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ (by 2.3(1)), it must then be constant. By Remark 2.4(1) this implies that φ is homogeneous, and by 2.5 we conclude that φ is linear, contradicting $0 \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi$. Thus $\mathcal{K}_\varphi \ne \emptyset$ is impossible under the present hypotheses, and 2.6 is proved.

3 $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates for a class of linear equations.

Here we assume $\alpha \in (0,\frac{1}{2})$ and $w \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1,\mathbb{R}^k)$ is a 2-valued symmetric function, and we continue to use the notation $\mathcal{K}_w = \{x \in B_1 : w(x) = \{0,0\}, Dw(x) = \{0,0\}\}$. Observe that then $|w(x)| \le Cd(x)^{1+\alpha}$ and $|Dw(x)| \le Cd(x)^\alpha$ for some constant C, where $d(x)$ is distance of x to $\mathcal{K}_w$.

We assume $B_\rho(y) \subset B_1$ and $w = (w^1,\ldots,w^k)$ satisfies a system of the form

3.1 $$\Delta w_\kappa + D_j(a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} D_i w_\lambda) + b^{\lambda j}_\kappa D_j w_\lambda + c^\lambda_\kappa w_\lambda = 0, \quad \kappa = 1,\ldots,k$$

weakly on each ball $B_\sigma(z) \subset B_\rho(y) \setminus \mathcal{K}_w$, where the coefficients $a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}, b^{\lambda j}_\kappa, c^\lambda_\kappa$ are single valued. The main estimate is as follows:

3.2 Lemma. *Let $\alpha \in (0,\delta(n))$ with $\delta(n)$ as in* Lemma 2.5 *and* Corollary 2.6*. There is $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\alpha,n,k) \in (0,1/2)$ such that the following holds for any $\beta \ge 0$. Suppose* 3.1 *holds (weakly in $B_\rho(y) \setminus \mathcal{K}_w$) and*

$$|a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}|_{0,B_\rho(y)} \le \varepsilon_0, \quad \rho^\alpha [a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}]_{\alpha,B_\rho(y)} + \rho|b^\lambda_{\kappa j}|_0 + \rho^2 |c^\lambda_\kappa|_0 \le \beta.$$

Then

$$\rho^{-1} \sup_{B_{\rho/2}(y)} |w| + \rho^{-\alpha} \sup_{B_{\rho/2}(y)} |Dw| + [Dw]_{\alpha,B_{\rho/2}(y)} \le C\rho^{-1-\alpha-n/2} \|w\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))},$$

with $C = C(n, k, \beta)$.

Proof of Lemma 3.2: In view of scaling and standard interpolation inequalities it suffices to consider the case $\rho = 1$ and prove

$$[Dw]_{\alpha,B_{1/2}} \le C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{1}$$

To begin with we'll prove the formally weaker inequality that for each $\delta > 0$ there is $C = C(\delta, \beta, n) \ge 1$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\delta, \beta, n) > 0$ such that the hypotheses of the lemma imply

$$[Dw]_{\alpha,B_{1/2}} \le \delta[Dw]_{\alpha,B_1} + C(|w|_{0,B_1} + |Dw|_{0,B_1}). \tag{2}$$

If this fails then there are fixed $\delta, \beta > 0$ and a sequence w_ℓ of solutions of 3.1, with $a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda,\ell}, b^{\lambda j}_{\kappa,\ell}, c^{\lambda}_{\kappa,\ell}$ in place of $a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}, b^{\lambda j}_{\kappa}, c^{\lambda}_{\kappa}$ respectively, where

$$|a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda,\ell}|_{0,B_1} \le \ell^{-1}, \quad [a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda,\ell}]_{\alpha,B_1} + |b^{\lambda j}_{\kappa,\ell}|_{0,B_1} + |c^{\lambda}_{\kappa,\ell}|_{0,B_1} \le \beta, \tag{3}$$

yet

$$[Dw_\ell]_{\alpha,B_{1/2}} > \delta[Dw_\ell]_{\alpha,B_1} + C_\ell(|w_\ell|_{0,B_1} + |Dw_\ell|_{0,B_1}), \quad C_\ell \to \infty. \tag{4}$$

Let $\mathcal{K}_\ell = \{x \in B_1 : w_\ell(x) = \{0,0\}, Dw_\ell(x) = \{0,0\}\}$ and select distinct points $x_\ell, y_\ell \in B_{1/2}$ with $|x_\ell - y_\ell|^{-\alpha}|Dw_\ell(x_\ell) - Dw_\ell(y_\ell)| > \frac{1}{2}[Dw_\ell]_{\alpha,B_{1/2}}$. Observe that

$$\rho_\ell = |x_\ell - y_\ell| \to 0 \tag{5}$$

because otherwise $[Dw_\ell]_{\alpha,B_{1/2}} < 2\rho_\ell^{-\alpha}|Dw_\ell(x_\ell) - Dw_\ell(y_\ell)| \le 4\sigma^{-\alpha}|Dw_\ell|_{0,B_1}$ with some fixed constant $\sigma > 0$ (independent of ℓ), hence $[Dw_\ell]_{\alpha,B_{1/2}} < 4\sigma^{-\alpha}C_\ell^{-1}[Dw_\ell]_{\alpha,B_{1/2}}$ by (4), a contradiction for ℓ large enough to ensure $4\sigma^{-\alpha}C_\ell^{-1} < 1$.

Then consider the possibilities:

Case 1: $\dfrac{\operatorname{dist}(\overline{x_\ell y_\ell}, \mathcal{K}_\ell)}{|x_\ell - y_\ell|}$ is bounded above

Case 2: $\dfrac{\operatorname{dist}(\overline{x_\ell y_\ell}, \mathcal{K}_\ell)}{|x_\ell - y_\ell|}$ is not bounded above,

where $\overline{x_\ell y_\ell}$ is the line segment joining x_ℓ and y_ℓ.

In either case we define

$$\widehat{w}_\ell(x) = \sigma_\ell \rho_\ell^{-1-\alpha} w_\ell(y_\ell + \rho_\ell x), \quad x \in B_{\rho_\ell^{-1}/2},$$

where

$$\sigma_\ell = [Dw_\ell]^{-1}_{\alpha,B_{1/2}}$$

and observe that then $\widehat{w}_\ell$ is 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}$ solution of a system of the same form on $B_{\rho_\ell^{-1}/2}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{w}_\ell(0) = \rho_\ell^{-1-\alpha}\sigma_\ell w_\ell(y_\ell), \quad \widehat{w}_\ell(\xi_\ell) = \rho_\ell^{-1-\alpha}\sigma_\ell w_\ell(x_\ell) \text{ where } \xi_\ell = \rho_\ell^{-1}(x_\ell - y_\ell) \in S^{n-1},\\ &[D\widehat{w}_\ell]_{\alpha, B_{\rho_\ell^{-1}/2}} < \delta^{-1}, \quad |D\widehat{w}_\ell(\xi_\ell) - D\widehat{w}_\ell(0)| \ge \tfrac{1}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

If Case 1 holds there is a bounded sequence z_ℓ with $z_\ell \in \mathcal{K}_{\widehat{w}_\ell}$ for each ℓ. Thus we have $[D\widehat{w}_\ell]_{\alpha, B_{\rho_\ell^{-1}/2}} < \delta^{-1}$, $|D\widehat{w}_\ell(\xi_\ell) - D\widehat{w}_\ell(0)| \ge \frac{1}{2}$, $\widehat{w}_\ell(z_\ell) = 0$ and $D\widehat{w}_\ell(z_\ell) = 0$, so in particular for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have, for ℓ such that $\rho_\ell^{-1}/2 > |x|$, $|D\widehat{w}_\ell(x)| = |D\widehat{w}_\ell(x) - D\widehat{w}_\ell(z_\ell)| \le |x - z_\ell|^\alpha [D\widehat{w}_\ell]_{\alpha, B_{\rho_\ell^{-1}}} \le \delta^{-1}|x - z_\ell|^\alpha$ and $|\widehat{w}_\ell(x)| = |\widehat{w}_\ell(x) - \widehat{w}_\ell(z_\ell)| \le \delta^{-1}|x - z_\ell|^{1+\alpha}$. By the Arzela-Ascoli theorem we can thus take a subsequence such that $\widehat{w}_\ell$ converges locally in C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^n$ to a $C^{1,\alpha}$ symmetric harmonic function φ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and which has the properties that $[D\varphi]_{\alpha,\mathbb{R}^n} < \infty$ and $D\varphi$ is not constant. By 2.6 we conclude that this function must be affine if $\alpha \in (0, \delta(n))$, which contradicts the fact that $D\varphi$ is non-constant.

In Case 2 we have a subsequence of ℓ and a corresponding sequence $R_\ell \to \infty$ with $B_{R_\ell} \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \widehat{w}_\ell(x) = 0 \text{ and } D\widehat{w}_\ell(x) = 0\} = \emptyset$ and so $\widehat{w}_\ell$ gives a single-valued $C^{1,\alpha}$ functions $\widetilde{w}_\ell$ on B_{R_ℓ} with $[D\widetilde{w}_\ell]_{\alpha, B_{R_\ell}} \le 1$. Let $\overline{w} = \widetilde{w}_\ell - \widetilde{w}_\ell(0) - \sum_{j=1}^n x_j D_j \widetilde{w}_\ell(0)$ and $|D\overline{w}_\ell(\xi_\ell) - D\overline{w}_\ell(0)| \ge \frac{1}{2}$. Evidently $\overline{w}_\ell$ weakly satisfies the system $D_j((\delta_{ij}\delta_{\kappa\lambda} + a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}(y_\ell + \rho_\ell x))D_i\overline{w}_\ell) = D_j((a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}(y_\ell + \rho_\ell x) - a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}(y_\ell))D_i\widetilde{w}_\ell(0)) = 0$. So since $|D\widetilde{w}_\ell(0)| = \sigma_\ell\rho_\ell^{-\alpha}|Dw_\ell(y_\ell)| \le C_\ell^{-1}\rho_\ell^{-\alpha}$ by (4), and $\rho_\ell^{-\alpha}|a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}(y_\ell + \rho_\ell x) - a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}(y_\ell)| \le [a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}]_\alpha \le \beta$, we see the $\overline{w}_\ell$ has a subsequence converging locally in C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^n$ to a single-valued harmonic function φ with $\varphi(0) = 0, D\varphi(0) = 0$, $D\varphi$ non-constant and $[D\varphi]_\alpha \le 1$. But then, since $\alpha < 1$, φ is linear, a contradiction.

Thus (2) is proved, and by standard interpolation it implies

$$[Dw]_{\alpha, B_{1/2}} \le 2\delta [Dw]_{\alpha, B_1} + C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)},$$

with $C = C(n, k, \delta, \beta)$, and the same must hold with appropriately scaled quantities over and sub-ball of B_1; specifically,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^{1+\alpha+n/2}[Dw]_{\alpha, B_{\rho/2}(y)} &\le 2\delta\rho^{1+\alpha+n/2}[Dw]_{\alpha, B_\rho(y)} + C\|w\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}\\ &\le 2\delta\rho^{1+\alpha+n/2}[Dw]_{\alpha, B_\rho(y)} + C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}\end{aligned}$$

for every ball $B_\rho(y) \subset B_1$, with $C = C(n, k, \delta, \beta)$, and, by taking $\delta = \delta(n)$ suitably small and using a standard covering argument (see e.g. [Sim97, p398]), this implies

$$[Dw]_{\alpha, B_{1/2}} \le C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}$$

as claimed.

4 2-valued C^1 harmonic functions—Part II

Using 3.2 and the frequency function, we can now prove the following regularity theorem for 2-valued harmonic functions.

4.1 Lemma. *Suppose φ, not identically zero, is a 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}$ function on B_1 which is smooth harmonic on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$. Then the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{K}_\varphi$ is $\leq n-2$, with equality if $\mathcal{B}_\varphi \neq \emptyset$, and φ is of class $C^{1,1/2}$, $|\varphi(x)| \leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_1)} d(x)^{3/2}$ and $|D\varphi(x)| \leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_1)} d(x)^{1/2}$ for all $x \in B_{1/2}$, where $d(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, \mathcal{K}_\varphi)$.*

Furthermore, if φ extends to all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ as a homogeneous degree $\frac{3}{2}$ function then, modulo composition with an orthogonal transformation of $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\varphi(x) = \varphi(re^{i\theta}, 0) = \{\pm C r^{3/2} \sin 3\theta/2\}$ for some constant C, where $r = (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{1/2}$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1: As in the proof of 2.5, we can assume that $k = 1$, so that φ is real-valued symmetric.

In view of the $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates and Remark 2.3(4) we have

$$\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y) \geq 1 + \alpha \tag{1}$$

for each $y \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi$.

We are going to use a dimension reduction argument based on the monotonicity of the frequency $N_\varphi(y, \rho)$ analogous to the procedure in [Alm00]. To prove dimension $\mathcal{K}_\varphi \leq n-2$ we suppose the contrary, that there is $s > n-2$ with $\mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{K}_\varphi \cap B_1) > 0$. Let μ_s be the outer measure defined on subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ by $\mu_s(A) = \inf \sum_{j=1}^\infty \rho_j^s$, where the inf is taken over countable unions of balls $\cup_{j=1}^\infty B_{\rho_j}(y_j)$ such that $A \subset \cup_{j=1}^\infty B_{\rho_j}(y_j)$. Note that $\mathcal{H}^s(A) > 0$ if and only if $\mu_s(A) > 0$. Thus $\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_\varphi \cap B_1) > 0$, and hence there is a point $z \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi \cap B_1$ such that the upper density $\theta^\star_{\mu_s}(\mathcal{K}_\varphi, z) = \limsup_{\rho \downarrow 0} \rho^{-s} \mu(\mathcal{K}_\varphi \cap B_\rho(z)) > 0$, so that there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\sigma_j \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \sigma_j^{-s} \mu_s(\mathcal{K}_\varphi \cap B_{\sigma_j}(z)) > 0 \tag{2}$$

Set $\varphi_j(x) = (\sigma_j^{-n/2} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_{\sigma_j}(z))})^{-1} \varphi(z + \sigma_j x)$ for $x \in B_{\sigma_j^{-1}(1-|z|)}$. In view of (2) we have

$$\liminf_{j \to \infty} \mu_s(\mathcal{K}_{\varphi_j} \cap \overline{B}_1) > 0 \tag{3}$$

By virtue of the $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates of 3.2, and the Remarks 2.3(4),(5) and 2.4(1) we also have that a subsequence $\varphi_{j'}$ converges locally in C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^n$ to a 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha} \cap W^{2,2}$ function ψ which is homogeneous of some degree > 1 (in fact $\geq 1 + \alpha$) on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\|\psi\|_{L^2(B_1)} = 1$, harmonic on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\psi$, $0 \in \mathcal{K}_\psi$ and $\mathcal{N}_\psi(0) = \mathcal{N}_\varphi(z)$. Also $\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_\psi \cap \overline{B}_1) \geq$

$\limsup_{j'\to\infty}\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_{\varphi_{j'}}\cap\overline{B}_1)(>0$ by (3)), because if $\delta>0$ we can choose $B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell)$ with $\mathcal{K}_\psi\cap\overline{B}_1\subset\cup_\ell B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell)$ and $\sum_\ell\rho_\ell^s<\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_\psi\cap\overline{B}_1)+\delta$, and, since the convergence is C^1, we see that $\mathcal{K}_{\varphi_{j'}}\cap\overline{B}_1\subset\cup_\ell B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell)$ for all sufficiently large j' and hence $\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_\psi\cap\overline{B}_1)>\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_{\varphi_{j'}}\cap\overline{B}_1)-\delta$ for all sufficiently large j', whence $\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_\psi\cap\overline{B}_1)\geq\limsup_{j'\to\infty}\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_{\varphi_{j'}}\cap\overline{B}_1)>0$ as claimed.

Thus we can repeat the argument with ψ in place of φ and with new base point $z\in\mathcal{K}_\psi\setminus\{0\}$ as origin, and this gives us a homogeneous harmonic ψ_1, not identically zero, but still with $\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_{\psi_1})>0$ and with $0\in\mathcal{K}_{\psi_1}$ and ψ_1 invariant under composition with translations in the direction of λz ($\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$). Since $s>n-2$ we can repeat this process a further $n-2$ times to give finally a homogeneous $C^{1,\alpha}$ harmonic ψ_{n-1}, not identically zero and such that there is an $(n-1)$-dimensional subspace $L\subset\mathcal{K}_{\psi_{n-1}}$ with ψ_{n-1} invariant under composition with translations in the direction of vectors in L. However then, assuming without loss of generality that $L=\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\{0\}$, we have $\psi_{n-1}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)=f(x_n)$ (independent of $x_1,\ldots,x_{n-1}$) with f a 2-valued homogeneous symmetric C^1 function, harmonic on $\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$, not identically zero, and $f(0)=f'(0)=\{0,0\}$. Clearly no such function f exists so we have a contradiction. Hence $\mathcal{K}_\varphi$ is of Hausdorff dimension $\leq n-2$ as claimed.

Now suppose $y\in\mathcal{B}_\varphi$. Then $\mathcal{K}_\varphi\cap B_\rho(y)$ has positive $(n-2)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure for each $\rho\in(0,1-|y|)$, because otherwise (see the appendix) $B_\rho(y)\setminus\mathcal{K}_\varphi$ would be simply connected for some $\rho\in(0,1-|y|)$ and we could write $\varphi|B_\rho(y)=\{\pm\varphi_1\}$, where φ_1 is a single-valued harmonic function on $B_\rho(y)$, contradicting the fact that $y\in\mathcal{B}_\varphi$. Thus we can repeat the above dimension reducing argument with $s=n-2$ and starting at points z arbitrarily close to y, obtaining, after a total of $n-2$ steps and modulo a composition with an orthogonal transformation of $\mathbb{R}^n$, a homogeneous 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}$ harmonic function ψ, with $\|\psi\|_{L^2(B_1)}=1$, $0\in\mathcal{K}_\psi$, $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(z)\geq\mathcal{N}_\psi(0)$, ψ homogeneous of degree $m>1$ and invariant under composition with any translation in the direction of any vector in $\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, so that ψ is a function of just the first 2-variables $x_1=r\cos\theta, x_2=r\sin\theta$. Then (modulo composition with a rotation of $\mathbb{R}^2$) we must be able to write $\psi=\{\pm Cr^{m/2}\cos m\theta/2\}$ with m an integer ≥ 3, and hence $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(z)\geq\mathcal{N}_\psi(0)\geq 3/2$. Since we can repeat this argument at a sequence of points $z\in\mathcal{K}_\varphi$ with $z\to y$, we conclude by the upper semicontinuity 2.3(3) of $\mathcal{N}_\varphi$ that $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y)\geq 3/2$. Of course at points $y\in\mathcal{K}_\varphi\setminus\mathcal{B}_\varphi$ we must have $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y)\geq 2>3/2$. Thus in any case $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(y)\geq 3/2$ for $y\in\mathcal{K}_\varphi$ and hence by Remark 2.3(4) and standard estimates for single-valued harmonic functions (in balls $B_\rho(z)$ with $B_\rho(z)\cap\mathcal{K}_\varphi=\emptyset$) we have $|\varphi|\leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_1)}d^{3/2}$ and $|D\varphi|\leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_1)}d^{1/2}$ on $B_{1/2}$, as claimed.

Of course if φ is homogeneous of degree $3/2$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ to begin with, then $0 \in \mathcal{B}_\varphi$ (otherwise φ would be $\pm$ a single valued harmonic function, which of course would have integer homogeneity), the first step of the above dimension reducing argument would not be needed, and, by Remarks 2.4(1),(2), φ itself would be invariant under composition with translations by vectors in some $(n-2)$-dimensional subspace; that is, modulo composition with a rotation of coordinates, we would have $\varphi(x_1, x_2, y) = \varphi(re^{i\theta}, 0) = \{\pm Cr^{3/2} \sin 3\theta/2\}$ for some constant C, as claimed.

We next establish a gap lemma analogous to 2.5 for orders of homogeneity $\in (\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2} + \delta)$.

4.2 Lemma. *There is $\delta = \delta(n) \in (0,1)$ such that if $\varphi(x) = |x|^\sigma \varphi(|x|^{-1}x)$ is 2-valued symmetric locally $C^{1,\alpha}$ homogeneous degree σ function with $\sigma \in (\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2} + \delta)$ and with φ harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$, then $\varphi \equiv \{0, 0\}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof: Again, as in the proof of 2.5, we can assume that $k = 1$, so that φ is real-valued symmetric. The proof in this case is similar to Lemma 2.5, but not quite as simple. If the result is false, we would have a sequence φ_ℓ of 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}$ functions φ_ℓ harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_{\varphi_\ell}$, φ_ℓ not identically zero, and homogeneous of degree σ_ℓ, where $\frac{3}{2} < \sigma_\ell \downarrow \frac{3}{2}$. Assume that φ_ℓ is normalized so that $\|\varphi_\ell\|_{L^2(B_1)} = 1$. Then, by 3.2, $\varphi_\ell \to \varphi$ in C^1, where φ is $C^{1,\alpha}$ and homogeneous of degree $3/2$, and, by 4.1, modulo an orthogonal change of independent variables and a rescaling we have $\varphi(x) = \varphi(re^{i\theta}, 0) = \{\pm r^{3/2} \sin 3\theta/2\}$, assuming $x = (re^{i\theta}, x_3, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ and $r = (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{1/2}$. Take $\mathcal{K}_\ell = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\varphi_\ell(x)| = 0, |D\varphi_\ell(x)| = 0\}$.

Next let $\varphi_{\ell,j} = D_j \varphi_\ell$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{K}_\ell$. Direct computation shows that $\varphi_{\ell,1} \to \{\pm cr^{1/2} \sin \theta/2\}$ and $\varphi_{\ell,2} \to -\{\pm cr^{1/2} \cos \theta/2\}$ (for suitable $c = c(n) > 0$).

Now choose c_ℓ, d_ℓ to ensure $\varphi_{\ell,3} - c_\ell \varphi_{\ell,1} - d_\ell \varphi_{\ell,2}$ is orthogonal to $\operatorname{span}\{\varphi_{\ell,1}, \varphi_{\ell,2}\}$ on $S^{n-1} \cap K$—i.e. (Cf. (4) in the proof of Lemma 2.5)

$$\int_{S^{n-1} \cap K} (\varphi_{\ell,3} - c_\ell \varphi_{\ell,1} - d_\ell \varphi_{\ell,2}) \varphi_{\ell,j} = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \tag{1}$$

where $K = \{(x_1, x_2, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} : r^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}|y|^2\}$, and notice that we can assume that $\varphi_{\ell,3} - c_\ell \varphi_{\ell,1} - d_\ell \varphi_{\ell,2}$ are not identically zero on $\mathbb{R}^n$—otherwise the directional derivative of φ_ℓ in the direction $\eta_\ell = (-c_\ell, -d_\ell, 1, 0)$ would be zero on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and this would imply that φ_ℓ is cylindrical in the direction η_ℓ, which for $n \geq 2$ would enable us to reduce the dimension n in the statement of the lemma (from n to $n-1$); and so in fact, since the only homogeneous harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}$ are the linear functions which are homogeneous of degree 1, we can assume without loss of generality that this does not happen. So we can define $\psi_\ell = \|\varphi_{\ell,3} - c_\ell \varphi_{\ell,1} - d_\ell \varphi_{\ell,2}\|^{-1}_{L^2(S^{n-1})} (\varphi_{\ell,3} - c_\ell \varphi_{\ell,1} - d_\ell \varphi_{\ell,2})$.

For $\delta > 0$ let $\gamma_\delta(t) = \operatorname{sgn}(t)\,\max\{|t|-\delta, 0\}$ and observe that then $\gamma_\delta(\psi_\ell)$ has compact support in $S^{n-1}\setminus\mathcal{K}_\ell$, and hence (since ψ_ℓ is harmonic and homogeneous degree $\sigma_\ell - 1$) we have $\int_{S^{n-1}} \nabla_{S^{n-1}}\psi_\ell\cdot\nabla_{S^{n-1}}\gamma_\delta(\psi_\ell) = (\sigma_\ell-1)(\sigma_\ell+n-3)\int_{S^{n-1}}\psi_\ell\gamma_\delta(\psi_\ell)$. Thus letting $\delta\downarrow 0$ we obtain the identity $\int_{S^{n-1}}|\nabla_{S^{n-1}}\psi_\ell|^2 = (\sigma_\ell-1)(\sigma_\ell+n-3)\int_{S^{n-1}}\psi_\ell^2 = (\sigma_\ell-1)(\sigma_\ell+n-3)$ for each $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots$, and in particular we have a uniform bound on the L^2-norm of $\nabla_{S^{n-1}}\psi_\ell$ and so by Rellich's theorem in the limit as $\ell\to\infty$ this gives us 2-valued symmetric homogeneous degree $\frac{1}{2}$, harmonic ψ in $W^{1,2}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^n\setminus(\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}^{n-2}))$, and (by lower semicontinuity of the norm with respect to weak L^2 convergence)

$$\int_{S^{n-1}}|\nabla\psi|^2 \le \tfrac{1}{2}(n-\tfrac{3}{2})\int_{S^{n-1}}\psi^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}(n-\tfrac{3}{2}). \tag{2}$$

Since $\psi(r,\theta,y)$ is locally the C^0 limit of $\psi_\ell(r,\theta,y)$, each of which can be viewed for each fixed r, y with $r>0$ and $r^2+|y|^2=1$ as a 4π-periodic single valued function of θ, so $\psi(r,\theta,y)$ can also be viewed as a smooth 4π-periodic single valued function of θ (with $\psi(r,\theta+2\pi,y) = -\psi(r,\theta,y)$ by the symmetry), and we see that (1) above ensures that

(3) ψ is orthogonal to $r^{1/2}\cos\theta/2$, $r^{1/2}\sin\theta/2$ ($\theta\in[0,4\pi]$) in $L^2(S^{n-1}\cap K)$

(and the statement (3) makes sense). Defining $\psi_0 = r^{-1/2}\psi$, then ψ_0 is 2-valued symmetric homogeneous of degree zero on $\mathbb{R}^n\setminus(\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}^{n-2})$ and, with ∇ = gradient on S^{n-1},

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S^{n-1}}|\nabla\psi|^2 &= \int_{S^{n-1}}|\nabla(r^{1/2}\psi_0)|^2\\
&= \int_{S^{n-1}}\Big(r|\nabla\psi_0|^2 + \tfrac{1}{4}r^{-1}|\nabla r|^2\psi_0^2 + 2r^{1/2}\psi_0\nabla(r^{1/2})\cdot\nabla\psi_0\Big)\\
&= \int_{S^{n-1}}\Big(r|\nabla\psi_0|^2 + \tfrac{1}{4}r^{-1}|\nabla r|^2\psi_0^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla(r)\cdot\nabla(\psi_0^2)\Big)\\
&= \int_{S^{n-1}}\Big(r|\nabla\psi_0|^2 + \tfrac{1}{4}r^{-1}|\nabla r|^2\psi_0^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\psi_0^2\Delta_{S^{n-1}}r\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

and since $\Delta_{S^{n-1}}r = \frac{1}{r} - (n-1)r$ and $|\nabla r|^2 = 1-r^2$, this implies

$$\int_{S^{n-1}}|\nabla\psi|^2 = \int_{S^{n-1}}\Big(r|\nabla\psi_0|^2 + \Big(\tfrac{1}{2}\Big(n-\tfrac{3}{2}\Big)r - \tfrac{1}{4}r^{-1}\Big)\psi_0^2\Big). \tag{4}$$

Since ψ_0 is homogeneous of degree zero we have, writing points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $(x,y) = (re^{i\theta}, y)$ with $r>0$ and $y\in\mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, $|\nabla\psi_0|^2 = |D\psi_0|^2 = r^{-2}(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\psi_0)^2 + (\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\psi_0)^2 + |D_y\psi_0|^2$ on $\mathbb{R}^n\setminus(\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}^{n-2})$, and so

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} r|\nabla\psi_0|^2 \ge \int_{S^{n-1}} r^{-1}\Big(\frac{\partial\psi_0}{\partial\theta}\Big)^2 \tag{5}$$

with equality if and only if ψ_0 is cylindrical in the sense that ψ_0 is independent of the variables r, y—i.e., equality holds in (5) if and only if ψ_0 is a function of θ alone. On the other hand we have the general fact (using Fourier series for f, f') that $\int_0^{4\pi}(f'(\theta))^2\,d\theta \geq \frac{1}{4}\int_0^{4\pi} f^2(\theta)\,d\theta$ for any Lipschitz 4π-periodic function f with $f(\theta+2\pi)\equiv -f(\theta)$ (so that f defines a 2-valued symmetric function on S^1), and equality holds if and only if $f(\theta)$ has the form $a\cos\theta/2+b\sin\theta/2$ for some constants a, b, and so we deduce from (5) that

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} r|\nabla\psi_0|^2 \geq \tfrac{1}{4}\int_{S^{n-1}} r^{-1}\psi_0^2, \tag{6}$$

with equality if and only if $\psi_0 \equiv \{\pm(a\cos\theta/2+b\sin\theta/2)\}$ for some constants a, b. Thus finally by (4),(6)

$$\int_{S^{n-1}}|\nabla\psi|^2 \geq \int_{S^{n-1}}\tfrac{1}{2}\Bigl(n-\tfrac{3}{2}\Bigr)r\psi_0^2 = \int_{S^{n-1}}\tfrac{1}{2}\Bigl(n-\tfrac{3}{2}\Bigr)\psi^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}\Bigl(n-\tfrac{3}{2}\Bigr),$$

with equality if and only if $\psi \equiv \pm r^{1/2}(a\cos\theta/2+b\sin\theta/2)$ for some constants a, b. However by (2) we do have equality, and hence $\psi(r,\theta,y)$ has the form $r^{1/2}(a\cos\theta/2+b\sin\theta/2)$ ($\theta\in[0,4\pi]$) for some constants a, b, which contradicts (3).

5 Regularity for $u_a = \frac{1}{2}(u_1+u_2)$ and $v = \pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1-u_2)$, Part I

First we observe that the 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$ function $v = \{\pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1-u_2)\}$ is just $(u-\{u_a,u_a\})$ (so we can write $u=\{u_1,u_2\}=u_a+v=\{u_a\pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1-u_2)\}$) and v and Dv vanish to orders $1+\alpha$ and α respectively on $\mathcal{K}_u=\{x : u_1(x)=u_2(x)\text{ and } Du_1(x)=Du_2(x)\}$; thus for each $\theta\in(0,1)$

5.1 $$|v(x)|\leq Cd(x)^{1+\alpha},\quad |Dv(x)|\leq Cd(x)^{\alpha},\quad x\in B_\theta$$

for some constant $C=C(\theta)$, where, here and subsequently, $d(x)=\operatorname{dist}(x,\mathcal{K}_v)$.

Before we begin the proof of the main estimates we need some general remarks about the nature of the equations governing $u=\{u_1,u_2\}$.

First, near points of $B_1\setminus\mathcal{K}_u$ we can represent u as an ordered pair (u_1,u_2) with each $u_\ell=(u_\ell^1,\ldots,u_\ell^k)$ a smooth $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued solution of the minimal surface system. Thus

5.2 $$\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^n D_i(G^{ij}(Du_\ell)D_ju_\ell^\kappa)=0,\quad \kappa=1,\ldots,k,\ \ell=1,2,$$

on $B_1\setminus\mathcal{K}_u$, where

$$G^{ij}(p)=\sqrt{g(p)}g^{ij}(p),\text{ with }(g^{ij}(p))=(g_{ij}(p))^{-1},$$
$$g_{ij}(p)=\delta_{ij}+\textstyle\sum_{\kappa=1}^k p_i^\kappa p_j^\kappa\text{ and }g(p)=\det(g_{ij}(p)),\ p=(p_i^\kappa)\in\mathbb{R}^n\otimes\mathbb{R}^k.$$

We also recall that the fact that the mean curvature of graph u is zero in $(B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_u) \times \mathbb{R}^k$ implies the identities

5.3 $$\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n D_i\big(G^{ij}(Du_\ell)\big) = 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n, \ell = 1, 2$$

on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_u$, so 5.2 can also be written in non-divergence form

5.4 $$\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^n G^{ij}(Du_\ell) D_i D_j u_\ell^\kappa = 0, \quad \kappa = 1, \ldots, k,\ \ell = 1, 2,$$

on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_u$.

We want to write these equations on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_u$ in more readily usable form, in terms of

$$u_a = \tfrac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_2), \quad v = \{\pm\tfrac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)\}$$

(note that u_a is then single-valued and v is 2-valued symmetric) and the functions

5.5 $$\begin{aligned} A^{ij}(p,q) &= G^{ij}(p+q) + G^{ij}(p-q) \\ E_\lambda^{ij\ell}(p,q) &= \int_{-1}^1 G^{ij}_{p_\ell^\lambda}(p+sq)\, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $A^{ij}, E_\lambda^{ij\ell}$ are real-analytic functions of $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathbb{R}^k$ and (using the definitions and the symmetry $G^{ij}(p) = G^{ij}(-p)$) we have the symmetries

5.6 $$\begin{aligned} A^{ij}(p,q) = A^{ij}(p,-q) = A^{ij}(-p,q) = A^{ij}(-p,-q) \\ E_\lambda^{ij\ell}(p,q) = E_\lambda^{ij\ell}(p,-q) = -E_\lambda^{ij\ell}(-p,q), \end{aligned}$$

and in particular

5.7 $$E_\lambda^{ij\ell}(0,q) = 0 \text{ and } D_q A^{ij}(p,0) = 0,$$

whence we can write

$$E_\lambda^{ij\ell}(p,q) = \sum_{\kappa=1}^k \sum_{h=1}^n E_{\kappa\lambda}^{ijh\ell}(p,q) p_h^\kappa$$

for suitable real-analytic $E_{\kappa\lambda}^{ijh\ell}$ with the symmetries

5.8 $$E_{\kappa\lambda}^{ijh\ell}(p,q) = E_{\kappa\lambda}^{ijh\ell}(p,-q) = E_{\kappa\lambda}^{ijh\ell}(-p,-q).$$

Notice that $E_\lambda^{ij\ell}$ arises naturally from the calculus identity

$$G^{ij}(p+q) - G^{ij}(p-q) = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{d}{dt} G^{ij}(p+tq)\, dt = \sum_{\lambda=1}^k \sum_{\ell=1}^n E_\lambda^{ij\ell}(p,q) q_\ell^\lambda, \quad p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathbb{R}^k$$

In view of the evenness of $A^{ij}(p,q), E^{ij\ell}_{\lambda}(p,q), E^{ijh\ell}_{\kappa\lambda}(p,q)$ with respect to q we see that

$$A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv),\; E^{ij\ell}_{\lambda}(Du_a, Dv),\; E^{ijh\ell}_{\kappa\lambda}(Du_a, Dv)$$

are actually single-valued (rather than 2-valued) and 5.3 implies

5.3’
$$\begin{cases} D_i(A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv)) = 0 \\ D_i(E^{ij\ell}_{\lambda}(Du_a, Dv)D_\ell v^{\lambda}) = \{0,0\} \end{cases}$$

on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_u$. Also by first taking the difference of the two equations in 5.2 and writing $u_1 = u_a + \frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)$ and $u_2 = u_a - \frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)$ we obtain

5.9
$$\begin{aligned} &D_i\Big(\big(G^{ij}\big(Du_a + Dv\big) + G^{ij}\big(Du_a - Dv\big)\big)D_j v^{\kappa}\Big) \\ &\qquad + D_i\Big(\big(G^{ij}\big(Du_a + Dv\big) - G^{ij}\big(Du_a - Dv\big)\big)D_j u_a^{\kappa}\Big) = \{0,0\} \end{aligned}$$

and, by taking the sum,

5.9’
$$\begin{aligned} &D_i\Big(\big(G^{ij}\big(Du_a + Dv\big) + G^{ij}\big(Du_a - Dv\big)\big)D_j u_a^{\kappa}\Big) \\ &\qquad + D_i\Big(\big(G^{ij}\big(Du_a + Dv\big) - G^{ij}\big(Du_a - Dv\big)\big)D_j v^{\kappa}\Big) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_u$. In terms of the single-valued functions $A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv), E^{ij\ell}_{\lambda}(Du_a, Dv)$, these equations can be written

5.10
$$D_i\Big(A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv)D_j v^{\kappa} + E^{ij\ell}_{\lambda}(Du_a, Dv)D_\ell v^{\lambda} D_j u_a^{\kappa}\Big) = \{0,0\}$$

5.11
$$D_i\Big(A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv)D_j u_a^{\kappa} + E^{ij\ell}_{\lambda}(Du_a, Dv)D_\ell v^{\lambda} D_j v^{\kappa}\Big) = 0$$

on $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_u$ for $\kappa = 1, \ldots, k$. In view of $5.3'$ these can also be written in non-divergence form as

5.10’
$$A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv)D_i D_j v^{\kappa} + E^{ij\ell}_{\lambda}(Du_a, Dv)D_\ell v^{\lambda} D_i D_j u_a^{\kappa} = \{0,0\}$$

5.11’
$$A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv)D_i D_j u_a^{\kappa} + E^{ij\ell}_{\lambda}(Du_a, Dv)D_\ell v^{\lambda} D_i D_j v^{\kappa} = 0$$

5.12 Remark: We shall use the fact that 5.11 actually holds in the weak sense on all of B_1 (i.e. across $\mathcal{K}_u$ also.) To see this, note that the first variation formula 1.2 for the stationary varifold $G = \operatorname{graph} u$ can be written $\int_G \nabla_i \zeta \, d\mathcal{H}^n = 0$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, n+k$ and any smooth ζ with compact support in $B_1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$, where $\nabla\zeta = (\nabla_1\zeta, \ldots, \nabla_{n+k}\zeta) = P_x(D\zeta)$, where P_x is orthogonal projection onto the tangent space of G at $(x, u(x))$. Since G is bounded we can of course take ζ to be a $C^{\infty}_c(B_1)$ function (i.e. ζ can be taken independent of the variables $x_{n+1}, \ldots, x_{n+k}$), in which case for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ the above formula can be written

$$\int_{B_1} \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n (\nu_i^\kappa(Du_1) + \nu_i^\kappa(Du_2)) D_i\zeta = 0, \quad \zeta \in C^1_c(B_1),$$

where $\nu_i^\kappa(Du_\ell) = \sum_{j=1}^n G^{ij}(Du_\ell) D_j u_\ell^\kappa$ as in 5.2, so indeed this identity is exactly the weak form, over all of B_1, of 5.11.

With these facts at our disposal we can prove some initial rough $C^{1,1-\varepsilon}$ estimates for u_a and $C^{1,\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ estimates for v:

5.13 Lemma. *There is $\varepsilon_0(n)$ such that if 1.6 holds with $\varepsilon_0 \le \varepsilon_0(n)$ and if $u_a = \frac{1}{2}(u_1+u_2)$ and $v = \{\pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)\}$, then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $C = C(n, \varepsilon)$ with*

$$\sup_{x \in B_{1/2} \setminus \mathcal{K}_u} d(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} |Dv(x)| < C\varepsilon_0,$$

$$\sup_{y \in B_{1/2} \cap \mathcal{K}_u, x \in B_{1/2}} |x - y|^{-1+\varepsilon} |Du_a(x) - Du_a(y)| < C\varepsilon_0, \ \sup_{x \in B_{1/2}} d(x)^\varepsilon |D^2 u_a(x)| < C\varepsilon_0.$$

Remark: We ultimately show that the above inequalities are valid with $\varepsilon = 0$ but we need the above lemma in the course of the proof of this.

Proof of Lemma 5.13: We can assume $B_{1/2} \cap \mathcal{K}_u \neq \emptyset$, otherwise we use standard quasilinear elliptic theory (for single-valued solutions) to give the claimed estimates over $B_{1/2}$. We claim that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\rho_0 = \rho_0(\varepsilon) \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ such that $y \in B_{1/2} \cap \mathcal{K}_u$ and $\rho < \rho_0 \Rightarrow (\rho/2)^{-n/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/2}(y))} \le 2^{-3/2+\varepsilon} \rho^{-n/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}$. Otherwise there would be sequences $y_\ell \in \overline{B}_{1/2} \cap \mathcal{K}_u$ and $\rho_\ell \downarrow 0$ such that

$$(\rho_\ell/2)^{-n/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_\ell/2}(y_\ell))} > 2^{-3/2+\varepsilon} \rho_\ell^{-n/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell))}$$

for all ℓ. After a translation and rescaling transforming $B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell)$ to $B_1(= B_1(0))$ and $v(x)$ to $v_\ell(x) = \beta_\ell^{-1} v(y_\ell + \rho_\ell x)$ (where $\beta_\ell = \rho_\ell^{-n/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell))}$), we can use Lemma 3.2 (the local Schauder estimates) to first show that v_ℓ converges in $C^{1,\beta}$, for each $\beta < \alpha$, locally in B_1 to give a $C^{1,\alpha}$ symmetric 2-valued harmonic function φ with $0 \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi$, $\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le 1$ and $2^{n/2} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})} \ge 2^{-3/2+\varepsilon}$. However by Lemma 4.1 we know that $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(0) \ge 3/2$ and then by Remark 2.3(4) we have $2^{n/2} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})} \le 2^{-3/2}$ a contradiction. So as claimed we have $(\rho/2)^{-n/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/2}(y))} \le 2^{-3/2+\varepsilon} \rho^{-n/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}$ for each $\rho \le \rho_0$, and by iteration (taking $\rho = 2^{-j}\rho_0$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots,$) we conclude that we have the uniform decay $\sup_{y \in B_{1/2} \cap \mathcal{K}_u, \rho \le \rho_0} \rho^{-3/2+\varepsilon-n/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))} < \infty$, and then the claimed estimate $d(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} |Dv(x)| < \infty$ by using elliptic estimates for v (as ± a single valued solution in balls which do not intersect $\mathcal{K}_u$).

Note that the above estimates for v guarantee in particular that

$$\rho^{-1/2+\varepsilon}[D_iv^\lambda D_jv^\kappa]_{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon,B_\rho(y)} \le \beta, \quad y \in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u, \rho \in (0,\tfrac{1}{8}) \tag{1}$$

for some constant β.

The argument giving the estimates for u_a is similar, although since u_a is single-valued we can use the standard $C^{1,\alpha}$ theory rather than the $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates of Lemma 3.2. In fact for each $y \in B_{1/2}$ and $\kappa = 1,\ldots,k$ let

$$U_y^\kappa(x) = u_a^\kappa(x) - (x-y)\cdot Du_a^\kappa(y) - u_a^\kappa(y)$$

so that $U_y(y) = 0$ and $DU_y(y) = 0$ and 5.3', 5.12 and (1) imply

$$D_i(A^{ij}D_jU_y^\kappa) = D_jF_j \text{ on } B_{1/2},\ \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}[F_j]_{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon,B_\rho(y)} \le C\beta, \quad y\in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u, \rho\in(0,\tfrac{1}{8}), \tag{2}$$

where β is as in (1), and so the standard $C^{1,\alpha}$ Schauder theory implies

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}[Du_a]_{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon,B_{\theta\rho}(y)} &\equiv \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}[DU_y]_{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon,B_{\theta\rho}(y)} \\ &\le C\beta + C\rho^{-n/2-1}\|U_y\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}, y\in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u, \rho\in(0,\tfrac{1}{8}), \quad C = C(\theta).\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We claim there are $\rho_0 = \rho_0(u) \in (0,\frac{1}{8})$ and $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(u) \ge 2$ such that

$$(\rho/2)^{-n/2-1}\|U_y\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/2}(y))} \le \max\{\rho^{-n/2-1}\|U_y\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}, \lambda_0\beta\},\ y\in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u, \rho\in(0,\rho_0). \tag{4}$$

If this fails then there are sequences $\rho_\ell \downarrow 0$, $\lambda_\ell \uparrow \infty$ and $y_\ell \in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u$ with

$$\max\{\rho_\ell^{-n/2-1}\|U_{y_\ell}\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell))}, \lambda_\ell\beta\} < (\rho_\ell/2)^{-n/2-1}\|U_{y_\ell}\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_\ell/2}(y_\ell))} \tag{5}$$

and by (3)

$$\rho_\ell^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}[DU_{y_\ell}]_{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon,B_{\theta\rho_\ell}(y_\ell)} \le C(\theta)\max\{\rho_\ell^{-n/2-1}\|U_{y_\ell}\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell))}, \beta\} \tag{6}$$

for each $\theta \in (0,1)$. In particular (5) implies

$$\beta \le \lambda_\ell^{-1}(\rho_\ell/2)^{-n/2-1}\|U_{y_\ell}\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_\ell/2}(y_\ell))}$$

Defining $w_\ell(x) = \rho_\ell^{n/2}\|U_{y_\ell}\|^{-1}_{L^2(B_{\rho_\ell}(y_\ell))}U_{y_\ell}(y_\ell+\rho_\ell x)$ for $x\in B_1$, we then have a subsequence of w_ℓ which converges locally in B_1 with respect to the $C^{1,\gamma}$ norm for each $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon$ to a harmonic function φ with $\varphi(0) = 0$, $D\varphi(0) = 0$, $\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le 1$, $2^{n/2+1}\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})} \ge 1$ which is clearly impossible (because, by the estimates of 2.3(4) with $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(0) \ge 2$,

$\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_1)} \geq \rho^{-n/2-2}\|\varphi\|_{L^2(B_\rho)}$ for every $\rho < 1$ in case φ is single-valued harmonic on B_1 with $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $D\varphi(0) = 0$). Thus (4) is established, and can be written

$$\begin{aligned}\max\{(\rho/2)^{-n/2-1}\|U_y\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/2}(y))}, \lambda_0\beta\} \\ \leq \max\{\rho^{-n/2-1}\|U_y\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}, \lambda_0\beta\},\ y \in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u, \rho \in (0,\rho_0).\end{aligned}$$

By an iteration similar to that used for v, we thus have

$$\sup_{y\in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u, \rho\in(0,\rho_0)} \rho^{-n/2-1}\|U_y\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))} < \infty.$$

Then by (3) we have the estimate

$$\sup_{y\in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u, \rho\in(0,\rho_0)} \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}[Du_a]_{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon, B_{\theta\rho}(y)} < \infty$$

which evidently implies

$$\sup_{y\in B_{1/2}\cap\mathcal{K}_u, x\in B_{1/2}} |x-y|^{-1+\varepsilon}|Du_a(x) - Du_a(y)| < \infty,$$

and by using the non-divergence form 5.11' on balls $B_\rho(x) \subset B_1\setminus\mathcal{K}_u$ where $x \in B_{1/2}\setminus\mathcal{K}_u$ and $\rho < \min\{\rho_0, d(x)/2\}$ we get the remaining estimate $d(x)^\varepsilon|D^2u_a| \leq C$ as claimed.

5.14 Lemma. *$D^2u_a \in L^p(B_\rho(y))$ for each $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $D^2v \in L^2(B_\rho(y))$ for each ball $B_\rho(y)$ with $\overline{B}_\rho(y) \subset B_1$, and, for each $\theta \in (0,1)$, $\|D^2u_a\|_{L^2(B_{\theta\rho}(y))} \leq C\rho^{-2}\|u_a\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}$ and $\|D^2v\|_{L^2(B_{\theta\rho}(y))} \leq C\rho^{-2}\|v\|_{L^2(B_\rho(y))}$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.14: 5.10 and the second identity in 5.3' implies

$$\sum D_i\big(A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv)D_jv^\kappa\big) = -\sum E^{ij\ell}_\lambda(Du_a, Dv)D_\ell v^\lambda D_iD_ju^\kappa_a,$$

and by using 5.13 to bound the right side, we see that this can be written

$$\sum D_i\big(A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv)D_jv^\kappa\big) = f^\kappa, \quad |f^\kappa| \leq C\varepsilon_0.$$

With $\zeta \in C^\infty_c(B_\rho(y))$, we multiply this equation by $D_\ell(\gamma_\delta(D_\ell v^\kappa)\zeta^2)$, where $\gamma_\delta(t) = \operatorname{sign}(t)\max\{|t|-\delta, 0\}$, and we integrate over $B_\rho(y)$. Integrating by parts twice on the left then gives the identity

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)} D_\ell\big(A^{ij}(Du_a, Dv)D_jv^\kappa\big)D_i\big(\gamma_\delta(D_\ell v^\kappa)\zeta^2\big) = \int_{B_\rho(y)} f^\kappa D_\ell(\gamma_\delta(D_\ell v^\kappa)\zeta^2)$$

In view of 5.13 and 5.7 we see that

$$\begin{aligned}|D_\ell[A^{ij}(Du_a,Dv)]||Dv| &\le (|D_pA(Du_a,Dv)||D^2u_a|+|D_qA(Du_a,Dv)||D^2v|)|Dv|\\ &\le C(|Du||D^2u_a|+|Dv||D^2v|)|Dv|\le C\varepsilon_0,\end{aligned}$$

so this identity can be written

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)} A^{ij}(Du_a,Dv)D_\ell D_jv^\kappa D_i\big(\gamma_\delta(D_\ell v^\kappa)\zeta^2\big) = \int_{B_\rho(y)}(f^\kappa\delta_{i\ell}+g^\kappa)D_i(\gamma_\delta(D_\ell v^\kappa)\zeta^2)$$

with

$$|g^\kappa|\le C\varepsilon_0.$$

Choosing ζ as a standard cut-off function in the ball $B_\rho(y)$ with $\zeta\equiv 1$ in $B_{\rho/2}(y)$, and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on the right, we conclude

$$\rho^{-n}\int_{B_{\rho/2}(y)\cap\{|D_\ell v^\kappa|>\delta\}}|DD_\ell v^\kappa|^2\le C\rho^{-2}\varepsilon_0^2$$

with C independent of δ. Letting $\delta\downarrow 0$ and summing over ℓ,κ we thus obtain $D^2v\in L^2(B_{\rho/2}(y))$ with $\rho^{-n/2}\|D^2v\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/2}(y))}\le C\rho^{-1}\varepsilon_0$.

In view of Remark 5.12 we can now use a standard quasilinear elliptic difference quotient argument on the equation 5.11 to establish that $D^2u_a\in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_1)$.

To prove that $D^2u_a\in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_1)$ for $p\ge 2$ we first observe that, since $D^2u_a, D^2v\in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_1)$ by the above discussion, 5.3 now holds globally on B_1 both pointwise a.e. and in the weak send, and so, by virtue of Remark 5.12, 5.11' holds a.e. on B_1 and can be written

$$\sum A^{ij}D_iD_ju_a^\ell=F^\kappa,\quad |F^\kappa|\le C|Dv||D^2v|=C|D^2v|^{\frac{2}{p}}(|Dv||D^2v|^{1-\frac{2}{p}})\le C|D^2v|^{\frac{2}{p}}$$

by virtue of 5.13. Since $|D^2v|^{\frac{2}{p}}\in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_1)$ (because $|D^2u_a|\in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_1)$) we can then use the standard interior Calderon-Zygmund L^p estimates to prove $D^2u_a\in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_1)$ as claimed.

6 Some Growth Results for a Class of Linear Equations

Here we consider $C^{1,\alpha}(B_1,\mathbb{R}^k)\cap W^{2,2}(B_1,\mathbb{R}^k)$ functions $w=(w^1,\dots,w^k)$ which are either single-valued or 2-valued symmetric, and we suppose w is a solution of a linear equation

6.1 $$D_j(a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}(x)D_iw^\lambda)=0 \text{ on } B_1\setminus\mathcal{K}_w,\quad \kappa=1,\dots,k,$$

where $\mathcal{K}_w = \{x : w(x) = 0 \text{ and } Dw(x) = 0\}$ in the single-valued case and $\mathcal{K}_w = \{x : w(x) = \{0,0\} \text{ and } Dw(x) = \{0,0\}\}$ in the 2-valued case; of course in the 2-valued case we as usual take 6.1 to mean that we can locally, near each point of $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_w$ write $w = \pm w_1$ with w_1 a $C^{1,\alpha}$ weak solution of the equation. We also assume

6.2 $$a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{\kappa\lambda} + b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}, \quad b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}(0) = 0, \quad [b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}]_{\alpha,B_1} \le \beta,$$

and $w \in W^{2,2}(B_1)$, with the estimates

6.3 $$\|D^2 w\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/2})} \le \beta\rho^{-2}\|w\|_{L^2(B_\rho)}, \quad \rho \in (0,1),$$

where $\beta > 0$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$ in the single-valued case, and $\alpha \in (0,\delta)$ with $\delta = \delta(n)$ as in 3.2 in the 2-valued case.

Observe that, subject only to 6.1, 6.2 and the assumption $w \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1, \mathbb{R}^k)$, the Schauder estimates in Lemma 3.2 are applicable to give

6.4 $$\rho^\alpha [Dw]_{\alpha,B_{3\rho/4}} + \sup_{B_{3\rho/4}} |Dw| + \rho^{-1}\sup_{B_{3\rho/4}} |w| \le C(\rho^{-2-n}\int_{B_\rho} |w|^2)^{1/2}$$

for $\rho < \rho_0$, where $\rho_0 = \rho_0(n,k,\beta) \in (0,1)$ is suitably small.

Now, for the moment, assume $|w(0)| = 0$, let $\rho \in (0,1), \theta \in (0,1/2)$ and that λ is the mean value of $|w|^2$ on $B_{\theta\rho}$ (so that $\lambda = |B_{\theta\rho}|^{-1}\int_{B_{\theta\rho}} |w|^2$). Then the appropriate version of the Poincarè inequality ([GT83, §7.8]) on B_ρ implies

$$\int_{B_\rho} ||w|^2 - \lambda| \le \gamma\rho \int_{B_\rho} |D|w|^2|, \quad \gamma = \gamma(n,\theta),$$

whence

$$\int_{B_\rho} |w|^2 \le \lambda|B_\rho| + \gamma\rho\int_{B_\rho} |D|w|^2|,$$

and on the other hand $\lambda = |w|^2(y)$ for some $y \in B_{\theta\rho}$ and $|w|^2(0) = 0$, so by 1-variable calculus we have $\lambda \le \theta\rho \sup_{B_{\theta\rho}} |D|w|^2| \le 2\theta\rho\sup_{B_{\theta\rho}}(|Dw||w|)$ and hence by 6.4

$$\int_{B_\rho} |w|^2 \le C\theta\int_{B_\rho} |w|^2 + \gamma\rho\int_{B_\rho} |D|w|^2|, \quad C = C(n,k,\beta),$$

hence by choosing $\theta = (2C)^{-1}$ and using Cauchy-Schwarz we get

6.5 $$\int_{B_\rho} |w|^2 \le C\rho^2\int_{B_\rho} |Dw|^2, \quad C = C(n,k,\beta),$$

provided 6.1, 6.2 hold and $|w(0)| = 0$.

We next show that a "doubling condition" for w is sufficient to establish a suitable monotonicity and bounds for the frequency function $N_w(\rho)$ of w, which is the function of $\rho \in (0,1)$ defined by

$$N_w(\rho) = \frac{\rho^{2-n}\int_{B_\rho}|Dw|^2}{\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}|w|^2}$$

6.6 Lemma. *If $w \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$, if the hypotheses 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 hold, if $0 \in \mathcal{K}_w$, and if there is $\gamma > 1$ and $\sigma \in (0,1/2]$ such that*

$$\|w\|_\rho \le \gamma \|w\|_{\rho/2} \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,\sigma], \quad \textit{where } \|w\|_\rho = \Big(\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho} w^2\Big)^{1/2},$$

then

$$\int_{B_\rho} w^2 \le C\gamma^2 \int_{B_{\rho/2}} w^2 \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,\sigma], \quad C = C(n),$$

and

$$\frac{d}{d\rho}\Big(e^{\Lambda\rho^\alpha} N_w(\rho)\Big) \ge 0 \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,\sigma], \qquad \textit{where } \Lambda = \Lambda(n,\alpha,\beta,\gamma).$$

Furthermore, for each sequence $\rho_j \downarrow 0$ there is a subsequence $\rho_{j'}$ such that $\rho_{j'}^{n/2}\|w\|^{-1}_{L^2(B_{\rho_{j'}})} w(\rho_{j'}x) \to \varphi(x)$ in C^1 locally on $\mathbb{R}^n$, where φ is a homogeneous harmonic 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}$ in the two-valued case, and smooth harmonic in the single-valued case, and

$$e^{\Lambda\rho^\alpha} N_w(\rho) \ge \mathcal{N}_w(0) = \mathcal{N}_\varphi(0) \ge 3/2 \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,\sigma] \textit{ in the 2-valued case,}$$
$$\textit{hence } \|w\|_\rho \le C\|w\|_\sigma(\rho/\sigma)^{3/2} \textit{ for } \rho \in (0,\sigma]$$
$$e^{\Lambda\rho^\alpha} N_w(\rho) \ge \mathcal{N}_w(0) = \mathcal{N}_\varphi(0) \ge 2 \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,\sigma] \textit{ in the single-valued case,}$$
$$\textit{hence } \|w\|_\rho \le C\|w\|_\sigma(\rho/\sigma)^{2} \textit{ for } \rho \in (0,\sigma],$$

where $C = C(n,\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$.

Remark: Note that Λ, C do not depend on σ in the above lemma.

Proof of Lemma 6.6: First observe that by integrating the inequality

$$\int_{\partial B_\rho} w^2 \le 2^{n-1}\gamma^2 \int_{\partial B_{\rho/2}} w^2 \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,\sigma] \tag{1}$$

with respect to ρ we conclude immediately that

$$\int_{B_\rho} w^2 \le C\gamma^2 \int_{B_{\rho/2}} w^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \in (0,\sigma] \tag{2}$$

as claimed. Define N_w as above, i.e.

$$N_w(\rho) = \frac{\rho^{2-n}\int_{B_\rho}|Dw|^2}{\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}|w|^2}. \tag{3}$$

Since $w^\lambda D_j w^\kappa$ and $D_i w^\lambda D_j w^\kappa$ are single valued $W^{1,1}$ functions on B_1 with $D_\ell(w^\lambda D_j w^\kappa) = (D_\ell w^\lambda) D_j w^\kappa + w^\lambda D_\ell D_j w^\kappa$ and $D_\ell(D_i w^\lambda D_j w^\kappa) = (D_\ell D_i w^\lambda) D_j w^\kappa + D_i w^\lambda D_\ell D_j w^\kappa$ a.e. on B_1, and since we can use the weak form of 6.1 to check that $\int_{B_1}(\Delta w^\kappa) w^\kappa \zeta = -\int_{B_1} b^{i\ell}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\lambda_i D_\ell(w^\kappa \zeta)$ and $\int_{B_1}(\Delta w^\kappa) w^\kappa_j \zeta_j = -\int_{B_1} b^{i\ell}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\lambda_i D_\ell(w^\kappa_j \zeta_j)$ for $\zeta, \zeta_j \in C^1_c(B_1)$, it is straightforward to check the two identities

$$\int_{B_1} w^\kappa_i D_i\big(w^\kappa \zeta\big) = \int_{B_1} b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\lambda_i D_j\big(w^\kappa \zeta\big), \tag{4}$$

and

$$\int_{B_1}\big(|Dw^\kappa|^2 \delta_{ij} - 2 w^\kappa_i w^\kappa_j\big) D_i \zeta_j = 2\int_{B_1} b^{i\ell}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\lambda_i (w^\kappa_j D_\ell \zeta_j + D_\ell w^\kappa_j \zeta_j) \tag{5}$$

for any Lipschitz functions $\zeta, \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n$ with compact support in B_1, where $w^\lambda_i = D_i w^\lambda$ and repeated indices indicate summation as usual. Notice that the second identity is checked directly by integrating by parts in the expression on the left, using the fact that $D^2 w \in L^2$ and $D_j(a^{\ell j}_{\kappa\lambda} D_\ell w^\lambda) = 0$ a.e. on B_1. Using 6.2 to give $|b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}| \le \beta\rho^\alpha$ in each of these identities, and letting ζ approximate the indicator function of B_ρ in the first identity and letting ζ_i approximate x_i times in the indicator function of B_ρ in the second identity, we obtain the two key inequalities

$$\Big|\int_{B_\rho} |Dw|^2 - \int_{\partial B_\rho} w w_r\Big| \le C\rho^\alpha \int_{B_\rho} |Dw|^2 + C\rho^\alpha \int_{\partial B_\rho} |w||Dw| \tag{6}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big|(n-2)\int_{B_\rho} |Dw|^2 - \rho\int_{\partial B_\rho} |Dw|^2 + 2\rho\int_{\partial B_\rho} w_r^2\Big| \\ &\qquad \le C\rho^\alpha \int_{B_\rho} |Dw|^2 + C\rho^{\alpha+1}\int_{\partial B_\rho} |Dw|^2 + C\rho^{\alpha+1}\int_{B_\rho} |Dw||D^2 w| \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Next we observe that by direct computation we have, weakly in B_1,

$$\Delta |w|^2 = 2|Dw|^2 + 2 b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\kappa_i w^\lambda_j - 2 D_j(b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\lambda w^\kappa_i).$$

Integrating this over B_ρ and using the identity $\int_{B_\rho} \Delta f = \rho^{n-1}\frac{d}{d\rho}(\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho} f)$ with $f = |w|^2$, we then conclude

$$\rho^{n-1}\tfrac{d}{d\rho}\big(\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2\big) = 2\int_{B_\rho} (|Dw|^2 + b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\kappa_i w^\lambda_j) - 2\rho^{-1}\int_{\partial B_\rho} x^j b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\kappa_i w^\lambda,$$

hence

$$\tfrac{d}{d\rho}\big(\int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2\big) = (n-1)\rho^{-1}\int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2 + 2\int_{B_\rho} (|Dw|^2 + b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\kappa_i w^\lambda_j) - 2\rho^{-1}\int_{\partial B_\rho} x^j b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} w^\kappa_i w^\lambda, \tag{8}$$

which by 6.2 evidently implies, for $\rho \le \rho_0(n,k,\beta)$,

$$\tfrac{d}{d\rho}\int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2 \ge -C\rho^\alpha \int_{\partial B_\rho} |w||Dw|.$$

By integrating this with respect to ρ we obtain

$$\int_{\partial B_\tau} |w|^2 \le \int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2 + C\rho^\alpha \int_{B_\rho} |w||Dw|, \quad \tau < \rho \le \rho_0,$$

where $\rho_0 \in (0,1)$ depends only on n, β and k. Integration with respect to $\tau \in (0,\rho)$ then shows

$$\int_{B_\rho} |w|^2 \le \rho \int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2 + C\rho^{\alpha+1} \int_{B_\rho} |w||Dw|, \quad \rho \le \rho_0. \tag{9}$$

We can also use (8) and the estimates 6.4 to give the upper bound

$$\tfrac{d}{d\tau}\Big(\int_{\partial B_\tau} |w|^2\Big) \le C\rho^{-2} \int_{B_\rho} |w|^2, \quad \tau \le \rho/2,\ \rho < 1,$$

which integrates to give

$$\int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2 \le C\rho^{-1} \int_{B_{2\rho}} |w|^2, \quad \rho < 1/2. \tag{10}$$

Thus if we have

$$\|w\|_\rho \le \gamma \|w\|_{\rho/2} \quad \rho \in (0,\sigma] \tag{11}$$

then by 6.4, (8) and (9) we have

$$\int_{B_\rho} (\rho^2|Dw|^2 + |w|^2) + \rho \int_{\partial B_\rho} \rho^2 |Dw|^2 \le C \min\{\rho \int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2, \int_{B_\rho} |w|^2\}, \quad \rho \in (0,\sigma], \tag{12}$$

and, by (10), (11), 6.4 and 6.5

$$\int_{\partial B_\rho} |w|^2 \le C \min\{\rho \int_{B_\rho} |Dw|^2, \rho^{-1} \int_{B_\rho} |w|^2\} \tag{13}$$

for each $\rho \in (0,\sigma]$. Now let

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho) = \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_\rho} |Dw|^2, \quad \mathcal{H}(\rho) = \rho^{1-n} \int_{\partial B_\rho} w^2,$$

and observe that $\mathcal{H}(\rho)$ never vanishes for $\rho \in (0,\sigma]$ by virtue of (11) and (12), so we can define

$$N(\rho) = \mathcal{D}(\rho)/\mathcal{H}(\rho),$$

and note that by (12) and (13) we have

$$C^{-1} \le N(\rho) \le C, \quad \rho \in (0,\sigma]. \tag{14}$$

Also by (7), (12) and 6.3 we have

$$|(n-2)\int_{B_\rho}|Dw|^2 - \int_{\partial B_\rho}|Dw|^2 + 2\int_{\partial B_\rho} w_r^2| \le C\rho^\alpha \min\{\rho\int_{\partial B_\rho}|w|^2, \int_{B_\rho}|w|^2, \rho^2\int_{B_\rho}|Dw|^2\} \tag{15}$$

for every $\rho \in (0,\sigma]$, assuming (11), which implies

$$\mathcal{D}'(\rho) \ge 2\int_{\partial B_\rho}|w_r|^2 - C\rho^\alpha \min\{\rho\int_{\partial B_\rho}|w|^2, \int_{B_\rho}|w|^2, \rho^2\int_{B_\rho}|Dw|^2\} \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,\sigma], \tag{16}$$

Also, by virtue of (6) we have

$$\mathcal{H}'(\rho) = 2\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho} w w_r = \rho^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\rho) + E, \quad \text{with } |E| \le \rho^{\alpha+1-n}\int_{B_\rho}(\rho^{-2}|w|^2 + |Dw|^2) \tag{17}$$

Now

$$N'(\rho) = \frac{\mathcal{D}'(\rho)\mathcal{H}(\rho) - \mathcal{H}'(\rho)\mathcal{D}(\rho)}{\mathcal{D}(\rho)\mathcal{H}(\rho)}$$

and using (15), (16) and (17) we then get

$$N'(\rho) \ge \frac{2\mathcal{H}(\rho)\int_{\partial B_\rho} w_r^2 - 2(\mathcal{H}'(\rho))^2 - C\rho^{\alpha-1}\mathcal{H}^2(\rho)}{\mathcal{D}(\rho)\mathcal{H}(\rho)} \ge -C\frac{\rho^{\alpha-1}\mathcal{H}^2(\rho)}{\mathcal{D}(\rho)\mathcal{H}(\rho)},$$

where we used $\mathcal{H}(\rho)\int_{\partial B_\rho} w_r^2 - (\mathcal{H}')^2 = \rho^{2-2n}\big(\int_{\partial B_\rho} w^2 \int_{\partial B_\rho} w_r^2 - (\int_{\partial B_\rho} w w_r)^2\big) \ge 0$ by Cauchy-Schwarz. Finally in view of (14) we thus have

$$N'(\rho) \ge -C\rho^{\alpha-1}N(\rho),$$

which can be written

$$\frac{d}{d\rho}\Big(\exp(\alpha^{-1}C\rho^\alpha)\, N(\rho)\Big) \ge 0 \tag{18}$$

as claimed.

Now take a sequence $\rho_j \downarrow 0$ and let $w_j(x) = \lambda_j w(\rho_j x)$ with λ_j chosen to ensure that $\|w_j\|_{L^2(B_1)} = 1$ for each j. By virtue of the estimates 6.4 and (2) we have $|w_j|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_R)} \le C(R,n,\gamma)$ for all $R > 0$ and sufficiently large j depending on R, so a subsequence $w_{j'}$ converges locally in $\mathbb{R}^n$ in C^1 to a symmetric 2-valued $C^{1,\alpha}$ function φ and φ is evidently harmonic. Furthermore $N_{w_{j'}}(\rho) \to N_\varphi(\rho)$ for each fixed ρ, whereas by the monotonicity (18) we have $N_{w_{j'}}(\rho) \to \lim_{\sigma\downarrow 0} N_w(\sigma) = \mathcal{N}_w(0)$, independent of ρ. So $N_\varphi(\rho) \equiv \mathcal{N}_w(0)$ and hence φ is homogeneous by 2.4(1), and by 4.1 the order of homogeneity is $\ge 3/2$, so $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(0) \ge 3/2$ as claimed.

The rest of the proof, dealing with the single valued case, is similar.

Next we prove a growth lemma for w:

6.7 Lemma. *If $\alpha \in (0, \delta)$, $\delta = \delta(n)$ as in 3.2, there is $\rho_0 = \rho_0(n, k, \alpha, \beta) \in (0, 1/2]$ and $C = C(n, \alpha, \beta)$ and $\gamma = \gamma(n, k, \alpha, \beta)$ where $\gamma \in (3/2, 3/2 + \delta)$ in the 2-valued case and $\gamma \in (2, 3)$ in the single valued case, such that if the hypotheses 6.1, 6.2 hold and if we write $\|w\|_\rho = (\rho^{1-n} \int_{\partial B_\rho} w^2)^{1/2}$ for each $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$, then*

$\|w\|_{\rho/2} \geq 2^\gamma \|w\|_{\rho/4} \Rightarrow \|w\|_\sigma \geq (2\sigma/\rho)^\gamma \|w\|_{\rho/2}$ for each $\sigma \in [3\rho/4, \rho]$ and each $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$, so in particular (taking $\sigma = \rho$)

$$\|w\|_{\rho/2} \geq 2^\gamma \|w\|_{\rho/4} \Rightarrow \|w\|_\rho \geq 2^\gamma \|w\|_{\rho/2}$$

for each $\rho \in (0, 1]$.

6.8 Remark: In particular this lemma shows that if $\sigma \in (0, \frac{\rho_0}{2}]$ is such that $\|w\|_{2\sigma} \geq 2^\gamma \|w\|_\sigma$ then $\|w\|_{2^j\sigma} \geq 2^\gamma \|w\|_{2^{j-1}\sigma}$ for every $j = 1, \ldots$ such that $2^j\sigma \leq \rho_0$, which implies

$$\|w\|_\rho \leq C\rho^\gamma \|w\|_{\rho_0}$$

for all $\rho \in (\sigma, \frac{\rho_0}{2}]$, whence

$$\|w\|_\rho \leq C\rho^\gamma \|w\|_{L^2(B_1)} \text{ for all } \rho \in (\sigma, \tfrac{1}{2}].$$

Proof of Lemma 6.7: We give the proof first in the 2-valued case. If the contrary holds with $\rho_0 = 1/\ell$, $\rho = \rho_\ell$ and $w = w_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots$, then by rescaling $x \to \rho^{-1}x$ and using the $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates of 6.4 we see that a subsequence has a 2-valued symmetric $C^{1,\alpha}$ limit φ on B_σ for some $\sigma \in [3/4, 1]$ which is harmonic on $B_\sigma \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varphi$ and with $\rho^{-n/2-\gamma}\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial B_\rho)}$, as a function of $\rho \in [1/4, \sigma]$, taking a local maximum value at some $\rho_0 \in (1/4, \sigma)$. By the Remark 2.3(1) we know that $\log \|\varphi\|_\rho$ a convex function of $t = \log \rho$ for $\rho \in (1/4, \sigma)$ and hence so is $\log(\rho^{-\lambda}\|\varphi\|_\rho) = -\lambda t + \log \|\varphi\|_\rho$. A convex function attaining a local interior maximum is constant, hence $\rho^{-\lambda}\|\varphi\|_\rho$ is constant for $\rho \in (1/4, \sigma)$. Using the Remark 2.4 we then have that φ_r is a constant multiple of φ so that φ extends to all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ as a homogeneous degree γ function. Since we take $\gamma \in (3/2, 3/2 + \delta)$ with δ as in Lemma 4.2, this contradicts the result of Lemma 4.2.

The proof in case w is single valued is similar, except that we use $\gamma \in (2, 3)$ and since there are no single valued harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ which are homogeneous of non-integer degree, this again gives a contradiction.

Using Lemma 6.6 and Lemma 6.7, we can now prove the following regularity/decay result:

6.9 Theorem. *If $\alpha \in (0,\delta)$, $\delta = \delta(n)$ as in 3.2, there is $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n,p,\alpha,\beta) \in (0,1/2]$ and $C = C(n,p,\alpha,\beta)$ such that if $w \in C^{1,\alpha}$, if 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 hold and if $0 \in \mathcal{K}_w$, then in the 2-valued symmetric case we have*

$$\sup_{B_\rho} |w| \le C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}\rho^{3/2}, \quad \rho \in (0, \tfrac{1}{2}]$$

and in the single-valued case we have

$$\sup_{B_\rho} |w| \le C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}\rho^{2}, \quad \rho \in (0, \tfrac{1}{2}].$$

Proof: We give the proof in the 2-valued case first: First assume $0 \in \mathcal{K}_w \cap B_{1/2}$. Let $\delta = \delta(n) \in (0,1)$ be as in the 2-valued case of Lemma 6.6, and let $\gamma = 3/2 + \delta/2$. For suitable $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n,p) > 0$, we can apply the 2-valued case of Lemma 6.6. So let $\sigma \in [0,1]$ be $\inf\{\frac{1}{2}, \{\rho \in (0,1/2] : \|w\|_\rho \ge 2^\gamma \|w\|_{\rho/2}\}\}$. Then in accordance with Remark 6.8 we have

$$\|w\|_\rho \le C\rho^\gamma \|w\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le C\rho^{3/2}\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}, \quad \rho \in (\sigma, 1/2] \tag{1}$$

and, assuming $\sigma \ne 0$, $\|w\|_\rho < 2^\gamma \|w\|_{\rho/2}$ for every $\rho \in (0,\sigma]$, and hence by the 2-valued case of Lemma 6.6 we have

$$\|w\|_\rho \le C\|w\|_\sigma (\rho/\sigma)^{3/2}, \quad \rho \in (0,\sigma]. \tag{2}$$

Thus by combining (1) and (2) we have

$$\|w\|_\rho \le C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}\rho^{3/2}, \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,1/2],$$

and by integration with respect to ρ

$$\Big(\rho^{-n}\int_{B_\rho} w^2\Big)^{1/2} \le C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}\rho^{3/2}, \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,1/2].$$

Next observe that by the $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates we then have

$$\sup_{B_{\rho/2}} |w| \le C\Big(\rho^{-n}\int_{B_\rho} w^2\Big)^{1/2} \le C\|w\|_{L^2(B_1)}\rho^{3/2}, \quad \forall\, \rho \in (0,1/2].$$

This completes the proof in the 2-valued symmetric case. The proof in the single-valued case is similar except that we use $\gamma \in (2,3)$ and the single-valued cases of Lemmas 6.6, 6.7, and in place of 4.4 we use the standard fact that each single-valued homogeneous harmonic function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is given by a homogeneous harmonic polynomial and hence has integer order of homogeneity.

7 Regularity for $u_a = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_2)$ and $v = \pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)$, Part II

We first observe that, in view of Lemmas 5.13 and 5.14, the equation 5.10 has the correct form to ensure that Theorem 6.9 can be applied with $w = v$, whence we have

7.1 Theorem. *$v = \{\pm\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)\}$ is locally $C^{1,1/2}$ in B_1, and we have the estimates*

$$|v(x)| \le C\varepsilon_0 d(x)^{3/2}, \ \ |Dv(x)| \le C\varepsilon_0 d(x)^{1/2}, \ \ |D^2 v(x)| \le C\varepsilon_0 d(x)^{-1/2}, \quad x \in B_{1/2},$$

where $C = C(n,k)$ and $d(x) = \mathrm{dist}(x, \mathcal{K}_u)$.

In view of 5.11 we can also apply the single-valued case of Theorem 6.9 to the average $u_a = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_2)$ in balls centered at 0 (since we assume $u(0) = \{0,0\}$ and $Du(x) = \{0,0\}$). Thus we have

7.2
$$\sup_{B_\rho} |u_a| \le C\varepsilon_0 \rho^2 \quad \forall \rho \in (0,1].$$

We want to show that similar decay estimates hold for $u_a(x) - u_a(x_0) - (x - x_0)\cdot Du_a(x_0)$ on balls $B_\rho(x_0)$ for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{K}_u \cap B_{1/4}$:

7.3 Lemma. *If $x_0 \in B_{1/4} \cap \mathcal{K}_u$ then*

$$|u_a(x) - u_a(x_0) - (x - x_0) Du_a(x_0)| \le C\varepsilon_0 \rho^2$$

for all $x \in B_\rho(x_0)$, $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$.

Proof: Since $|Du_a| < \varepsilon_0$, we can choose an $(n+k)\times(n+k)$ orthogonal matrix $\mathcal{Q}$ with $|I - \mathcal{Q}| < C\varepsilon_0$ such that $\mathcal{Q}$ takes the tangent space of graph u_a at at the point $(x_0, u(x_0))$ to the space $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ and graph u = graph$\{u_1, u_2\}$ is transformed to graph$\{\widetilde{u}_1, \widetilde{u}_2\}$, where $\widetilde{u} = \{\widetilde{u}_1, \widetilde{u}_2\}$ is a $C^{1,1/2}$ function over $B_{1/4}$ with $[D\widetilde{u}]_{1/2} < C\varepsilon_0$,

$$(1) \qquad \begin{aligned} (\xi, \widetilde{u}_1(\xi)) &= (x - x_0, u_1(x) - u_a(x_0))\mathcal{Q} \\ (\eta, \widetilde{u}_2(\eta)) &= (x - x_0, u_2(x) - u_a(x_0))\mathcal{Q}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that since $(e_i, D_i u_a(x_0)$ is in the tangent space of graph u_a at $(x_0, u_a(x_0))$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we have $(e_i, D_i u_a(x_0))Q_k = 0$, where Q_k is the $(n+k)\times k$ matrix consisting of the last k columns of $\mathcal{Q}$, so for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we have

$$(2) \qquad (e_i, 0)Q_k = -D_i u_a(x_0) Q_{kk},$$

where Q_{kk} is the $k \times k$ matrix consisting of the last k rows of Q_k. On the other hand since $x - x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{0i})e_i$ we see from (1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{0i})(e_i, 0)Q_k + (u_1(x) - u_a(x_0))Q_{kk} &= \widetilde{u}_1(\xi) \\ \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{0i})(e_i, 0)Q_k + (u_2(x) - u_a(x_0))Q_{kk} &= \widetilde{u}_2(\eta), \end{aligned}$$

and so by (2)

$$\begin{aligned}\big(-(x-x_0)Du_a(x_0)+(u_1(x)-u_a(x_0))\big)Q_{kk}&=\widetilde{u}_1(\xi)\\ \big(-(x-x_0)Du_a(x_0)+(u_2(x)-u_a(x_0))\big)Q_{kk}&=\widetilde{u}_2(\eta),\end{aligned}$$

and by taking sums we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big(-(x-x_0)Du_a(x_0)+(u_a(x)-u_a(x_0))\big)Q_{kk}&=\tfrac{1}{2}(\widetilde{u}_2(\eta)+\widetilde{u}_1(\xi))\\ &=\tfrac{1}{2}(\widetilde{u}_a(\xi)+\widetilde{u}_a(\eta))+\tfrac{1}{4}((\widetilde{u}_1(\xi)-\widetilde{u}_2(\xi))-(\widetilde{u}_1(\eta)-\widetilde{u}_2(\eta)))\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{u}_a=\frac{1}{2}(\widetilde{u}_1+\widetilde{u}_2)$.

Since $|Q_{kk}-I|<C\varepsilon_0$, for ε_0 small enough (depending only on n,k) we then have

$$\begin{aligned}(3)\qquad &|u_a(x)-u_a(x_0)-(x-x_0)Du_a(x_0)|\\ &\qquad\le C\big(|\widetilde{u}_a(\xi)|+|\widetilde{u}_a(\eta)|+|(\widetilde{u}_1(\xi)-\widetilde{u}_2(\xi))-(\widetilde{u}_1(\eta)-\widetilde{u}_2(\eta))|\big).\end{aligned}$$

Notice also that by taking differences in (1) we have

$$(\xi-\eta,\widetilde{u}_1(\xi)-\widetilde{u}_2(\eta))=(0,u_1(x)-u_2(x))\mathcal{Q}$$

whence

$$(4)\qquad |\xi-\eta|<C|v(x)|\le C\varepsilon_0\rho^{3/2}$$

by 7.1.

Taking $\varepsilon_0=\varepsilon_0(n,k)$ small enough to ensure $C\varepsilon_0<\frac{1}{4}$, we consider the following 2 cases with $\sigma=\rho^{3/2}$: Case 1 $B_{2\sigma}(\xi)\cap\mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{u}}\neq\emptyset$ and Case 2 $B_{2\sigma}(\xi)\cap\mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{u}}=\emptyset$. In Case 1 we have by 7.1 (applied with $\widetilde{u}$ in place of u) and (4) that $|\widetilde{u}_1(\xi)-\widetilde{u}_2(\xi)|+|\widetilde{u}_1(\eta)-\widetilde{u}_2(\eta)|\le C\varepsilon_0\sigma^{3/2}\le C\varepsilon_0\rho^{9/4}\le C\varepsilon_0\rho^2$. In Case 2, for $\varepsilon_0=\varepsilon_0(n,k)$ small enough, we also have $B_{3\sigma/2}(x)\cap\mathcal{K}_u=\emptyset$ and hence there is a unique pair u_1,u_2 of smooth single valued functions on the ball $B_{3\sigma/2}(x)$ with $u|B_{3\sigma/2}(x)=\{u_1,u_2\}$ and corresponding smooth single valued $\widetilde{u}_1,\widetilde{u}_2$ on $B_\sigma(\xi)$ so that (1),(3) hold. Then by 1-variable calculus along the line segment joining ξ to η we get

$$(5)\qquad |(\widetilde{u}_1(\xi)-\widetilde{u}_2(\xi))-(\widetilde{u}_1(\eta)-\widetilde{u}_2(\eta))|\le\sup_{B_\sigma(\xi)}|D(\widetilde{u}_1-\widetilde{u}_2)|\sigma$$

and by 7.1 (applied with $\widetilde{u}$ in place of u) we have $\sup_{B_\sigma(\xi)}|D(\widetilde{u}_1-\widetilde{u}_2)|\le C\varepsilon_0\rho^{1/2}$, and so the right side of (5) is $\le C\varepsilon_0\rho^{1/2}\sigma=C\varepsilon_0\rho^2$. Thus in both Case 1 and Case 2 we conclude

$$|(\widetilde{u}_1(\xi)-\widetilde{u}_2(\xi))-(\widetilde{u}_1(\eta)-\widetilde{u}_2(\eta))|\le C\varepsilon_0\rho^2,$$

and hence using this together with 7.2 (applied to $\widetilde{u}_a$ instead of u_a) on the right of (3) we obtain

$$|(u_a(x) - u_a(x_0)) - (x - x_0)Du_a(x_0)| \le C\varepsilon_0\rho^2$$

as claimed

Finally we show that $u_a \in C^{1,1}$:

7.4 Theorem. *$u_a \in C^{1,1}(B_{1/8})$ with $\sup_{B_{1/8}} |D^2u_a| \le C\varepsilon_0$.*

Proof: The proof is based on the estimates of Theorem 7.1, Lemma 7.3 and elliptic estimates for single valued solutions. First note that by equation 5.11' and Theorem 7.1 we have

$$(1) \quad \textstyle\sum_{ij} a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} D_iD_ju^\lambda_a = F_\kappa \text{ with } |a^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda} - \delta_{ij}\delta_{\kappa\lambda}| \le C\varepsilon_0, \text{ and } |F_\kappa| \le C\varepsilon_0, \quad C = C(n,k),$$

$\kappa = 1, \ldots, k$, where we used Theorem 7.1 in checking that $|F_\kappa| \le C\varepsilon_0$. It is then standard (the L^2 elliptic theory applied to the function $u_a - u_a(x_0) - (x - x_0)\cdot Du_a(x_0)$, which satisfies the same equation (1)) that, provided $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n,k)$ is small enough,

$$\int_{B_{\rho/2}(x_0)} |D^2u_a|^2 \le C\rho^{-4}\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u_a - u_a(x_0) - (x - x_0)\cdot Du_a(x_0)|^2 + C\varepsilon_0^2\rho^n$$

for $x_0 \in B_{1/4} \cap \mathcal{K}_u$ and $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$, and by virtue of Lemma 7.3 this implies

$$(2) \qquad \rho^{-n}\int_{B_{\rho/2}(x_0)} |D^2u_a|^2 \le C\varepsilon_0^2, \quad x_0 \in B_{1/4} \cap \mathcal{K}_u,\ \rho \in (0, 1/4],$$

with C independent of x_0 and ρ, and hence $|D^2u_a(x_0)| \le C\varepsilon_0$ for a.e. $x_0 \in \mathcal{K}_u$. (Of course this latter statement is vacuous if $\mathcal{K}_u$ has measure zero, which we ultimately show must be the case.)

Now suppose that $x \in B_{1/8} \setminus \mathcal{K}_u$, choose $x_0 \in \mathcal{K}_u \cap B_{1/4}$ with $|x - x_0| = d(x)$, and let $\rho = |x - x_0|$. Then $u|B_\rho(x)$ can be represented as an ordered pair of C^∞ solutions of the minimal surface equation, each with gradient of length $\le C\varepsilon_0$, and 7.1 plus quasilinear elliptic estimates implies that the equation 5.10' can be written

$$(3) \qquad \Delta v^\kappa + b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}D_iD_jv^\lambda = 0 \text{ on } B_\rho(x),$$

with

$$(4) \qquad \sup_{B_{\rho/2}(x)} \rho|D_\ell b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}| + \rho^{3/2}[D_\ell b^{ij}_{\kappa\lambda}]_{1/2, B_{\rho/2}(x)} \le C\varepsilon_0,$$

By (4), Schauder theory (for single-valued solutions) can be applied in (3), giving

$$[D^2v]_{1/2, B_{\rho/4}(x)} \le C\rho^{-3/2}\varepsilon_0 \sup_{B_{\rho/2}(x)}|Dv| \le C\varepsilon_0\rho^{-1} \text{ by 7.1.}$$

Via another application of 7.1, this shows that the function F_κ on the right of (1) satisfies $[F_\kappa]_{1/2,B_{\rho/2}(x)} \le C\varepsilon_0\rho^{-1/2}$. Thus using (1) in combination with Schauder theory gives

$$\rho^{1/2}[D^2u_a]_{1/2,B_{\rho/4}(x)} \le C\varepsilon_0. \tag{5}$$

On the other hand by (2) with 4ρ in place of ρ we know there is a set of positive measure in $B_{\rho/4}(x)$ with $|D^2u_a| \le C\varepsilon_0$ and then (5) gives $\sup_{B_{\rho/4}(x)}|D^2u_a| \le C\varepsilon_0$ and hence in particular $|D^2u_a(x)| \le C\varepsilon_0$ as required.

8 A frequency function for v and the dimension of $\mathcal{K}_u$.

Using the key regularity results $u_a \in C^{1,1}(B_1)$ and $v \in C^{1,1/2}(B_1)$, we can now establish the monotonicity of a frequency function for v, and use it to bound the size of $\mathcal{K}_u$.

We first want to show that the above regularity results make it possible to obtain a suitable frequency function by directly modifying the work of Garofalo and Lin [GL86] to handle the present 2-valued setting and higher codimension. (Codimension $k > 1$ implies that stationarity of $G = \operatorname{graph} u$ puts us in an elliptic system setting rather than the single equation setting discussed in [GL86].)

In view of the estimates 7.1, 7.4 we see that the equation 5.11 for v^κ can be written in the form

8.1 $$\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^n D_i\big(A^{ij}D_jv_\kappa\big) + \sum_{\ell=1}^n\sum_{\lambda=1}^k E^\ell_{\kappa\lambda}D_\ell v^\lambda = 0, \quad \kappa = 1,\ldots,k,$$

with A^{ij} Lipschitz (real-valued) with small Lipschitz constant and $E^{\ell\lambda}_\kappa$ bounded:

8.2 $$|A^{ij}(x) - A^{ij}(y)| \le C\varepsilon_0|x-y|, \quad |E^\ell_{\kappa\lambda}(x)| \le C \ \forall x,y \in B_{1/2},$$

and $A^{ij}, E^{\ell\lambda}_\kappa$ single-valued. It is of crucial importance that we can thus write the equation for v as a system which is only weakly coupled (i.e. the top order part $D_i(A^{ij}D_jv^\kappa)$ involves application of the same scalar second order operator $D_i(A^{ij}D_j)$ to each component v^κ of v).

We now claim that, in view of 8.1, 8.2 (which depend of course on the main regularity results 7.1 and 7.4), we can make a straightforward modification of the work of Garofalo & Lin to establish a key monotonicity result for the function v.

Before stating the result we need to set up some notation:

In view of 8.2 we can assume without loss of generality that

$$\det(A^{ij}) \equiv 1,$$

because otherwise we can replace A^{pq} by $\det(A^{ij})^{-1/n}A^{pq}$ without changing the form of the equation 8.1 and at the same time ensuring 8.2 still holds with $C = C(n, k, \alpha)$. Then as in [GL86] we can view the operator $D_i(A^{ij}D_j)$ in 8.1 as the Laplacian with respect to the metric $\sum_{i,j} A_{ij}dx_idx_j$ where

$$(A_{ij}) = (A^{ij})^{-1}.$$

The fact that A_{ij} is Lipschitz is not sufficient to introduce normal coordinates, but following [AKS62] we can first multiply by the Lipschitz conformal factor

$$\eta(x) = A^{\ell m}(x)(x_\ell/r)(x_m/r), \quad r = (\textstyle\sum_j x_j^2)^{1/2},$$

to give a new metric

$$\widetilde{A}_{ij} = \eta A_{ij} = A^{\ell m}(x)(x_\ell/r)(x_m/r)A_{ij}.$$

Notice that indeed η is Lipschitz, because $A^{ij} = \delta_{ij}+a_{ij}$ with a_{ij} Lipschitz and $a_{ij}(0) = 0$, and hence $\eta = 1+\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(x_i/r)(x_j/r)$ which implies $|D_\ell\eta| \le C\sum_{i,j}(|D_\ell a_{ij}|+r^{-1}|a_{ij}|) \le C$. Thus the equation 8.1 can be written

$$\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^n D_i\Big(\widetilde{A}^{ij}D_jv_\alpha\Big) + \sum_{\ell=1}^n\sum_{\beta=1}^k \widetilde{E}_\alpha^{\ell\beta}D_\ell v_\beta = 0, \quad \alpha = 1,\dots,k,$$

where

$$\widetilde{A}^{ij} = (A^{\ell m}(x)(x_\ell/r)(x_m/r))^{\frac{n-2}{2}}A^{ij}.$$

Thus working with $\widetilde{g}_{ij}$ instead of g_{ij} involves merely multiplying the principal coefficients of the equation by the Lipschitz function $\eta^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$, where $\eta = \sum_{i,j}A^{ij}(x)(x_i/r)(x_j/r)$, and this does not change the form of the equation (or the boundedness of the coefficients of the first order terms). But it has the advantage (as proved in [AKS62]) that, provided we have 8.2 with $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, k)$ small enough, we can make a bilipschitz change of coordinates $y = \Gamma(x)$ with $\Gamma(0) = 0$,

$$\Gamma(B_1) \supset B_{1/2}, \quad \rho_0 = \rho_0(n),$$
$$\widetilde{A}_{ij}dx_idx_j = \widehat{g}_{ij}(y)dy_idy_j$$

such that the new coordinates have some of the key properties enjoyed by normal coordinates, including

$$\textstyle\sum_j \widehat{g}_{ij}y_j = y_i \text{ on } B_{1/2}, \quad i = 1,\dots,n,$$

and also having the property that the radial derivatives $D_r\widehat{g}_{ij} \equiv \sum_j|y|^{-1}y_jD_{y_j}\widehat{g}_{ij}$ are bounded:

$$|D_r\widehat{g}_{ij}| \le C, \quad C = C(n, k), i, j = 1,\dots,n.$$

Then, writing $\widehat{A}^{ij} = \sqrt{\widehat{g}}\,\widehat{g}^{ij}$, the equation 8.1 transforms to a new equation of the same form, Viz.,

8.3 $$\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^n D_i\Big(\widehat{A}^{ij}D_j\widehat{v}^\kappa\Big) + \sum_{\ell=1}^n\sum_{\lambda=1}^k \widehat{E}^\ell_{\kappa\lambda}D_\ell\widehat{v}^\lambda = 0, \quad \kappa = 1,\ldots,k,$$

where $\widehat{v} = v\circ\Gamma^{-1}$,

8.4 $$\widehat{A}^{ij}(0) = \delta_{ij}, \quad |D_r\widehat{A}^{ij}| \le C\,,^{\ddagger} \quad |\widehat{E}^{\ell\beta}_\alpha| \le C,$$

and where we now also have

8.5 $$\begin{aligned}&\textstyle\sum_j \widehat{A}^{ij}y_j \equiv \mu y_i,\ y\in B_{1/2}, \quad \mu = \sqrt{\widehat{g}} \quad i = 1,\ldots,n,\\ &|D_r\mu| \le C, \quad C^{-1}\le\mu\le C, \quad C = C(n,\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

8.6 Lemma. *There is $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n,k,\alpha)$ such that if $0\in\mathcal{K}_u$, if 1.2, 1.6 hold, and if $\widehat{v} = v\circ\Gamma^{-1}$, $\widehat{A}^{ij}$, and μ are as above, then the modified frequency function $\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho)$ defined by*

$$\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho) = \frac{\rho^{2-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}\mu\widehat{v}\cdot\widehat{v}_r\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}}{\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}\mu\,|\widehat{v}(y)|^2\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y)}$$

has the property that $(\exp C\rho)\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho)$ is increasing as a function of $\rho\in(0,\rho_0]$, where $C = C(n,k,\alpha)$, $\rho_0 = \rho_0(n,k,\alpha)\in(0,\frac12]$, and furthermore we can choose $\theta = \theta(n,k,\alpha)\in(0,1)$ so that for each $\beta > \widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho_0)$ we have the fixed lower bounds

$$\sigma^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\sigma}|\widehat{v}|^2\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \ge (\sigma/\rho)^{2\beta}\rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}|\widehat{v}|^2\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}, \quad 0<\sigma\le\rho\le\min\{\rho_0,\theta(\tfrac{\beta}{\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho_0)}-1)\}.$$

8.7 Remark: Notice that the modified frequency $\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}$ is of similar order to the usual frequency function $N_{\widehat{v}}(\rho) = \mathcal{D}(\rho)/\mathcal{H}(\rho)$, where $\mathcal{D}(\rho) = \rho^{2-n}\int_{B_\rho}\widehat{A}^{ij}\widehat{v}_i\cdot\widehat{v}_j$, $\mathcal{H}(\rho) = \rho^{1-n}\int_{\partial B_\rho}\mu|\widehat{v}|^2\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$, by virtue of the fact that

$$(1-C\rho)\mathcal{D}(\rho) \le \mathcal{I}(\rho) \le (1+C\rho)\mathcal{D}(\rho)$$

for sufficiently small ρ, where $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ is the quantity on the top line of $\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho)$ in 8.6 above, because 8.3 implies

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho) = \mathcal{I}(\rho) + \rho^{2-n}\int_{B_\rho}R(\widehat{v})\cdot\widehat{v}$$

with $R(\widehat{v})$ an $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued function such that $|R(\widehat{v})| \le C(|\widehat{v}| + |D\widehat{v}|)$, and 6.5 is applicable with $w = \widehat{v}$. (Only the fact that w satisfies an equation of the form of 8.3 and the fact that w was Lipschitz, rather than $C^{1,\alpha}$, was used to prove 6.5.)

[‡] We emphasize that the construction of [AKS62] only ensures boundedness of the radial derivative $D_r\widehat{A}^{ij}$, not the tangential derivatives.

Proof of 8.6. First note that (by applying the operator $\sum y_j D_{y_j}$ to equation 8.3 and using 8.4) we see

$$\textstyle\sum_j y_j D_{y_j} \widehat{v}_\lambda \in W^{1,2}(B_{1/2} \setminus \mathcal{K}_{\widehat{v}}), \quad \lambda = 1, \ldots, k.$$

Also by multiplying by $\gamma_\delta(\widehat{v})$ in 8.3, with $\gamma_\delta(t) = \operatorname{sign} t \, \max\{|t| - \delta, 0\}$, and integrating by parts we see that (after letting $\delta \downarrow 0$)

$$\int_{B_\rho} |D\widehat{v}|^2 \leq C\rho \int_{B_\rho} (|\widehat{v}|^2 + |D\widehat{v}|^2)$$

if $\widehat{v} \equiv \{0, 0\}$ on ∂B_ρ and hence for small enough ρ we use 6.5 (with $w = \widehat{v}$) to conclude that $\widehat{v} \equiv 0$ on B_ρ. Thus the modified frequency function $\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho)$ is well-defined for $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ for suitable $\rho_0 = \rho_0(n, k, \alpha)$.

In view of 8.3–8.5 we can now check the two basic identities (analogous to the identities in Remark 2.3(2) in the special case $\zeta_j(x) \equiv x_j$) :

8.8
$$\mathcal{D} \equiv \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_\rho} \widehat{A}_{kl} \widehat{v}_k \cdot \widehat{v}_l = \rho^{2-n} \int_{\partial B_\rho} \mu \widehat{v} \cdot \widehat{v}_r + \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_\rho} R(\widehat{v}) \cdot \widehat{v},$$

$$\begin{aligned}(n-2)\rho^{1-n} \int_{B_\rho} \widehat{A}^{kl} \widehat{v}_k \cdot \widehat{v}_l - \rho^{2-n} \int_{\partial B_\rho} \widehat{A}^{kl} \widehat{v}_k \cdot \widehat{v}_l &= -\rho^{2-n} \int_{\partial B_\rho} 2\mu |\widehat{v}_r|^2 \\ &\quad - \rho^{1-n} \int_{B_\rho} r(\widehat{A}^{kl,r} \widehat{v}_k \cdot \widehat{v}_l - 2R(\widehat{v}) \cdot \widehat{v}_r),\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

8.9
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}' &= \frac{d}{d\rho}\Big(\rho^{2-n} \int_{B_\rho} \widehat{A}^{kl} \widehat{v}_k \cdot \widehat{v}_l\Big) \\ &= \rho^{2-n} \int_{\partial B_\rho} 2\mu |\widehat{v}_r|^2 + \rho^{1-n} \int_{B_\rho} r(\widehat{A}^{kl}_r \widehat{v}_k \cdot \widehat{v}_l - 2R(\widehat{v}) \cdot \widehat{v}_r)\end{aligned}$$

where subscripts denote partial derivatives, $|R(\widehat{v})| \leq C(|\widehat{v}| + |D\widehat{v}|)$ and $\mu = \sqrt{g}$ as above. Using these identities we can now establish the required monotonicity as in [GL87, pp.358-364] with $rf(r) \equiv$const. (Notice we use 8.7, 8.8 and 8.9 in lieu of the corresponding inequalities/identities on p.358 of [GL87] and we do not need to refer back to [GL86] as is done in [GL87]).

To prove the last part of 8.6 observe that by the monotonicity of $\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho)$ and the inequalities of Remark 8.7 we have $N_{\widehat{v}}(\rho) \leq (1 + C\rho) N_{\widehat{v}}(\rho_0)$ for $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$. Also, by 8.8 and the fact that 6.5 is applicable with $w = \widehat{v}$ as discussed in 8.7, we have $\mathcal{H}'(\rho) \leq 2(1 + C\rho)\mathcal{D}(\rho)$, and then we have $\rho\mathcal{H}'(\rho)/\mathcal{H}(\rho) \leq 2(1 + C\rho)\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho_0) \leq 2\beta$ if $\rho \leq \rho_1$, where ρ_1 is a suitably small multiple (depending in n, k, α) of $\frac{\beta}{\widehat{N}_{\widehat{v}}(\rho_0)} - 1$. Hence we can integrate (as in Remark 2.3(4)) to conclude the stated bounds in the last part of 8.6.

8.10 Theorem. *Suppose $v \not\equiv 0$. Then the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{K}_v$ is at most $(n-2)$. Furthermore, either $\mathcal{B}_u = \emptyset$ or the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{B}_u$ is equal to $(n-2)$ and the $(n-2)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of $\mathcal{B}_u$ is positive.*

Proof: For the first claim of the theorem, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{H}^s\left(\mathcal{K}_v \cap B_{1/2}\right) = 0$ for every $s > n-2$. So fix $s > n-2$ and suppose that $\mathcal{H}^s\left(\mathcal{K}_v \cap B_{1/2}\right) > 0$. Let μ_s be the outer measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ as defined in §4 and, also as in §4, let $z \in \mathcal{K}_v \cap B_{1/2}$ be a point of positive upper density with respect to μ_s. Thus there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\sigma_j \to 0$ such that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \sigma_j^{-s} \mu_s\left(\mathcal{K}_v \cap B_{\sigma_j}(z)\right) > 0. \tag{1}$$

Let $v_z(x) = v(z+x)$. By 7.1 and 7.4 we have the interior $C^{1,1/2}$ and $W^{2,2}$ estimates

$$\sup_{B_{\theta\sigma}(y)} |v_z| + \sigma \sup_{B_{\theta\sigma}(y)} |Dv_z| + \sigma^{3/2} \sup_{x_1,x_2\in B_{\theta\sigma}(y),x_1\neq x_2} \frac{|Dv_z(x_1) - Dv_z(x_2)|}{|x_1-x_2|^{1/2}} \leq C\left(\sigma^{-n}\int_{B_\sigma(y)} |v_z|^2\right)^{1/2} \tag{2}$$

and

$$\sigma^{4-n}\int_{B_{\theta\sigma}(y)} |D^2 v_z|^2 \leq C\sigma^{-n}\int_{B_\sigma(y)} |v_z|^2 \tag{3}$$

for each $\sigma \in (0,1/4)$, $y \in B_{1/4}(z)$ and each $\theta \in (0,1)$, where $C = C(n,k,\theta,\alpha)$. It follows directly from these estimates that if we let $v_{z,\sigma_j}(x) = \sigma_j^{-n/2}\|v_z\|^{-1}_{L^2(B_{\sigma_j})} v_z(\sigma_j x)$ for $x \in B_1$, then after passing to a subsequence, we have that $v_{z,\sigma_j} \to \varphi$ for some 2-valued, symmetric function $\varphi \in C^{1,1/2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap W^{2,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where the convergence is in $C^{1,\beta}(B_\rho)$ for every $\rho > 0$ and $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, guaranteeing also that φ is harmonic. Also, as in the proof of 4.1, we have $\mu_s(\mathcal{K}_\varphi \cap B_1) > 0$.

We claim that φ is not identically zero. Indeed, by taking $\sigma = \theta\rho$ in the inequality in the last part of 8.6 and integrating with respect to ρ, we have, for each $\theta \in (0,1)$, $\int_{B_{\theta\rho}} |\widehat{v}|^2 \geq C(n,k,\alpha,\theta)\int_{B_\rho} |\widehat{v}|^2$. Since the change of coordinates Γ is bilipschitz this gives $\int_{B_{\rho/2}} |v|^2 \geq C(n,k,\alpha)\int_{B_\rho}|v|^2$, whence $\int_{B_{1/2}} |v_{z,\sigma_j}|^2 \geq C$ for some fixed $C > 0$ (independent of j) and φ is non-zero as claimed.

Thus φ is $C^{1,\alpha}$ harmonic, not identically zero, and $\mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{K}_\varphi) > 0$ for some $s > n-2$, which contradicts Lemma 4.1.

For the remaining assertion, note that if $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}\left(\mathcal{B}_u\right) = 0$ then by the result of the Appendix $B_1 \setminus \mathcal{B}_u$ is simply connected, so that $u|_{B_1\setminus\mathcal{B}_u} = \{u_1, u_2\}$ for a pair of smooth functions $u_1, u_2 : B_1\setminus\mathcal{B}_u \to \mathbb{R}^k$ each solving the minimal surface system. Since $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathcal{B}_u) = 0$ and u_1, u_2 are $C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$ it follows that in fact u_1, u_2 are weak $C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$ (hence smooth strong) solutions of the minimal surface system, which implies that $\mathcal{B}_u = \emptyset$.

Combining the codimension 1 case of Theorem 8.10 with the main regularity theorem of [Wic08], we obtain the following:

8.11 Theorem. *Let V be an n-dimensional stationary integral varifold in an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ arising as the weak limit of a sequence of stable minimal hypersurfaces M_j of U with M_j immersed away from a closed set K_j of locally finite $(n-2)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure for each j. Then the set of points $z \in \text{support}\, \|V\|$ where V has a multiplicity 2 tangent plane but* support $\|V\|$ *is not a smooth embedded submanifold near z has Hausdorff dimension at most $(n-2)$. In particular, the set of multiplicity 2 branch points of V (i.e. the set of points $z \in \text{support}\, \|V\|$ with the property that V has a multiplicity 2 tangent plane at z, but for no $\sigma > 0$ is* support $\|V\| \cap B^{n+1}_{\sigma}(z)$ *equal to a smooth immersed hypersurface of $B^{n+1}_{\sigma}(z)$) is either empty or has Hausdorff dimension equal to $(n-2)$ and locally positive $(n-2)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure.*

Appendix: A simple connectivity lemma.

The following lemma is presumably well known, but we include it here for the convenience of the reader since we have not found it in the literature.

Lemma. *If* Γ *is a closed subset of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *with* $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\Gamma)=0$*, then* $B_1\setminus\Gamma$ *is simply connected.*

Proof: We use induction on $n\ge 2$. In case $n=2$ the result is trivial because $\Gamma=\emptyset$ in this case. So assume that $n\ge 3$ and that the result holds with $n-1$ in place of n. $\overline{B}_1$ is bilipschitz homeomorphic to $\overline{Q}_1$, where Q_1 is the cylinder $B_1^{n-1}\times(-1,1)$, and this homeomorphism takes the compact set $\Gamma\cap\overline{B}_1$ to the compact set $\widetilde{\Gamma}$, where $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\widetilde{\Gamma})=0$, so it suffices to prove $Q_1\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is simply connected.

By the "rough coarea inequality" ([Fed69, 2.10.25]) we can pick $y_0\in(-1,1)$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-3}((\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\{y_0\})\cap\widetilde{\Gamma})=0. \tag{1}$$

Let $\gamma: S^1\to\mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary smooth closed curve contained in $Q_1\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}$, let

$$\delta=\min\{|x-y| : x\in\gamma,\ y\in\widetilde{\Gamma}\},$$

and let P denote the projection $(x^1,\ldots,x^{n-1},x^n)\mapsto(x^1,\ldots,x^{n-1},0)$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\{0\}$. Then $P(\widetilde{\Gamma})\times\mathbb{R}$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $(n-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure zero and hence its orthogonal projection onto any given hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^n$ also has $(n-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure zero. Thus if $\eta\in S^{n-1}$ and L is the hyperplane orthogonal to η, and if P_η is orthogonal projection of $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto L, then $A_\eta = P_\eta^{-1}(P_\eta(P(\widetilde{\Gamma})\times\mathbb{R}))$ is a set of $\mathcal{H}^n$-measure zero and every line $\ell_y(\eta)=\{y+\tau\eta:\tau\in\mathbb{R}\}$ with $y\notin A_\eta$ is disjoint from $A_\eta\cup(P(\widetilde{\Gamma})\times\mathbb{R})$. It is then elementary to construct an approximation $\widetilde{\gamma}: S^1\to\mathbb{R}^n$ to γ with $\max_{t\in S^1}|\widetilde{\gamma}(t)-\gamma(t)|<\delta$ and $\widetilde{\gamma}\subset Q_1\setminus(P(\widetilde{\Gamma})\times\mathbb{R})$. (We can construct such a $\widetilde{\gamma}$ by first taking a polygonal approximation to γ with edge segments $s_1,\ldots,s_N$ parallel to $\eta_1,\ldots,\eta_N\in S^{n-1}$ respectively, and then composing with a translation τ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ chosen to ensure that none of the translated segments $\tau(s_j)$ have endpoints in A_{η_j}, $j=1,\ldots,N$.)

Then γ can be homotopied in $Q_1\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}$ to $\widetilde{\gamma}$ via the homotopy $\gamma_s(t)=s\widetilde{\gamma}(t)+(1-s)\gamma(t)$, $s\in[0,1]$), and $\widetilde{\gamma}$ can be homotopied in $Q_1\setminus(P(\widetilde{\Gamma})\times\mathbb{R})$ to $\widetilde{\gamma}_1\subset Q_1\cap(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\{y_0\})$ via the homotopy $\widetilde{\gamma}_s(t)=(\widetilde{\gamma}_1(t),\ldots,\widetilde{\gamma}_{n-1}(t),sy_0+(1-s)\widetilde{\gamma}_n(t))$, $s\in[0,1]$. Finally by (1) and the inductive hypothesis $\widetilde{\gamma}_1$ can be homotopied in $Q_1\cap(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\{y_0\})\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}$ to a point, and the proof is complete.

References

[AKS62] N. Aronszajn, A. Krzywicki, and J Szarski, *A unique continuation theorem for exterior differential forms on riemannian manifolds*, Arkiv für Mat. **4** (1962), 417–453.

[Alm00] F. Almgren, *Almgren's big regularity paper. q-valued functions minimizing dirichlet's integral and the regularity of area-minimizing rectifiable currents up to codimension 2.*, World Scientific Monograph Series in Mathematics **1** (2000).

[Fed69] H. Federer, *Geometric measure theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1969.

[GL86] N. Garofalo and F.-H. Lin, *Monotonicity properties of variational integrals, a_p-weights, and unique continuation*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **35** (1986), 245–268.

[GL87] ———, *Unique continuation for elliptic operators: a geometric-variational approach*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **40** (1987), 347–366.

[GT83] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1983.

[Ros10] Leo Rosales, *The geometric structure of solutions to the two-valued minimal surface equation*, Calculus of Variations and PDE (2010).

[Sim97] L. Simon, *Schauder estimates by scaling*, Calculus of Variations and PDE **5** (1997), 391–407.

[SW07] L. Simon and N. Wickramasekera, *Stable branched minimal immersions with prescribed boundary*, Journal of Differential Geometry **75** (2007), 143–173.

[Wic08] N. Wickramasekera, *A regularity and compactness theory for immersed stable minimal hypersurfaces of multiplicity at most 2*, J. Diff. Geom. **80** (2008), 79–173.

Leon Simon
Mathematics Department
Stanford University
Stanford CA 94305, USA
lms@math.stanford.edu

Neshan Wickramasekera
DPMMS
University of Cambridge
Cambridge CB3 0WB, United Kingdom
N.Wickramasekera@dpmms.cam.ac.uk